

Also, petition of Arthur Boucher, H. N. Gartier, Holden O. Hill, Frank E. Chafee, John H. Hawbly, Charles Matteson, and Archibald Matteson, Providence, R. I., and Arnold Schaer, Warren, R. I., protesting against including mutual life insurance in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Atlantic Mills, Charles K. Hancock & Co., Mosberg Wrench Co., Brown & Sharpe Co., and Theodore Foster & Bros. Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation exempting labor organizations from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts (by request): Petition of B. T. Martin and other citizens of Chelsea, West Somerville, Winthrop, and Everett, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of E. C. Colman and other citizens of Woburn, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Henry E. Ayres, Thomas J. Sweeney, and other citizens of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against placing wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, Chicago, Ill., protesting against admitting Philippine tobacco and cigars free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on chiclet; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Carrol Lewis Maxey and other citizens of western Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union favoring passage of legislation relative to the closing of the gates of the Panama Exposition on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of the Political Study Club, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring legislation conferring the right of suffrage on women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bronston Bros. & Co., of New York, N. Y., relative to the straw-hat industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the George Urban Milling Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Primos Chemical Co., of Primos, Pa., against the reduction of the tariff on metal and alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cornell Equal Suffrage Club, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving women suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of the thirty-seventh congressional district of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of citizens of the thirtieth district of New York, favoring an amendment to the income-tax provision taxing mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to John Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of W. G. Van Name, favoring retention of provision prohibiting the importation of the skins and plumage of certain birds in tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILDER (by request): Petition of Rev. Emanuel C. Charlton and other citizens of Brookfield, C. L. Judkins and other citizens of Barre, and Frederick Foodick and citizens of Fitchburg, all of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of the Moehle Lithographic Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on lithographed articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the National Business League of America, favoring the retention in the consular service those officials of efficiency, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Shelby, N. C., against duty on monzonite and thorium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1913.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, source of all our longings, hopes, and aspirations, strengthen our arm of faith that we may draw nearer to Thee; be inspired with brighter hopes, a warmer, purer love for Thee and our fellow men; that selfishness may depart, evil cease, and brotherly love prevail; that godliness may enrich the heart, the home, society, the Nation; that the world may be a better dwelling place for all classes and conditions of men, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct a statement of mine in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings, in the closing of the tariff debate. In the crush attendant on the closing of the tariff debate last night I seem to have permitted a lapsus linguae, or more strictly speaking a "lapsus pencilibus." I spoke of the noble and generous Jane Addams as desiring pensions for all persons. I meant, instead, to refer to the Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], who only yesterday introduced a bill to provide old-age pensions of \$10 each for all persons over 65 years.

It was not my desire to criticize either Miss Addams or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], but to show that they, in connection with Vice President MARSHALL; former President Roosevelt; the Industrial Workers of the World leader, Bill Haywood; and the food poisoner, Ettore, are all striving—each with different motives—for the great brotherhood of man, but each one setting back this movement thousands of degrees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF TELEGRAPHS AND TELEPHONES.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a resolution passed by the city council of the city of Tacoma, one of the largest and most populous cities of the State of Washington, on the government ownership of telegraphs and telephones.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the paper which he sends to the Clerk's desk. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the resolution referred to:

Resolution 6129.

Whereas the telegraph and telephone are ever-increasing public necessities; and

Whereas these services could be more certainly and more fairly rendered under a system of government ownership of these utilities; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city council of the city of Tacoma, That it is the judgment of the council that the time is ripe for the acquisition of these utilities by the Government of the United States, and that the Congress of the United States be urged to take the necessary steps for the establishment of a Federal telegraph and telephone system rendering a local and interstate service like the Post Office Department; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk send copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington.

April 18, 1913. Adopted on roll call: Yeas 5, nays 0, absent 0.

W. W. SEYMOUR, Mayor.

Attest:

HOMER H. EDWARDS, City Clerk.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. Are there any Members here who desire to be sworn in?

Mr. STANLEY and Mr. PATTEN of New York appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill. By previous order of the House general debate on this bill is concluded, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act, except as otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the Islands of Guam and Tutuila) the rates of duty which are by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list of this section prescribed, namely:

DUTIABLE LIST.

Schedule A—Chemicals, oils, and paints.

1. Acids: Boracic acid, $\frac{3}{4}$ cent per pound; citric acid, 5 cents per pound; formic acid, $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; gallic acid, 4 cents per pound; lactic acid, $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; oxalic acid, 2 cents per pound; pyrogalllic acid, 10 cents per pound; salicylic acid, $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; tannic acid and tannin, 4 cents per pound; tartaric acid, $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; all other acids and acid anhydrides not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

On last Saturday evening, in the few moments of time allotted me, I made some reference to the fact that Thomas Jefferson was a protectionist, and made some quotations from his messages and writings. Yesterday I was asked by gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber if I could give the references. I am very glad to do it.

I read from the History of the Protection Laws, by R. W. Thomson, chapter 14, page 137. The first passage I shall read gives the views of Mr. Thomson himself. He says:

"The discussions which preceded and were called forth by the tariff law of 1816 were not confined to Congress alone, but became general throughout the country on account of the great public satisfaction felt at the result. Mr. Jefferson was then in retirement at his home in Virginia, but his interest in matters concerning the general welfare was not abated on account of his declining years, as is shown by his celebrated letter, written in 1816, to Benjamin Austin, wherein he professed himself as continuing to be the earnest friend of the protective system. His observations and experience had thoroughly matured his judgment, and the occasion enabled him to reaffirm the principles he had avowed during his Presidency. In this letter he said:

"Compare the present state of things with that of 1785, and say whether an opinion founded in the circumstances of that day can be fairly applied to those of the present. We have experienced what we then did not believe—that there exists both profligacy and power to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them for ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or, rather, assumes a new form. The grand inquiry is now, Shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of another nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence on that nation or be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say I am not of them. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort, and if those who quote me as of different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to any difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand that has so long wantonly violated it."

"So thoroughly imbued was Mr. Jefferson's mind with these sentiments and so ardent was he in his friendship for the system of protection that during the next year, 1817, he substan-

tially repeated them in another letter written to Mr. William Simpson, who had forwarded to him a pamphlet wherein protection to home manufactures was advocated. He then said:

"I have read with great satisfaction the eloquent pamphlet you were so kind as to send to me, and sympathize with every line of it. I was once a doubter whether the labor of the cultivator, aided by the creative power of the earth itself, could not produce more than that of the manufacturer alone and unassisted by the dead subject on which he acted; in other words, whether the more we could bring into action of the energies of our boundless territory in addition to the labor of our citizens the more would be our gain. But the inventions of the later times by labor-saving machines do now as much for the manufacturer as the earth for the cultivator. Experience, too, has proved that mine was but half the question. The other half is whether dollars and cents are to be weighed in the scale against real independence. The question is then solved, at least as far as respects our wants.

"I much fear the effects on our infant establishments (manufactures) of the policy avowed by Mr. Brougham and quoted in the pamphlet. Individual British merchants may lose by the late immense importations, but British commerce and manufactures in the mass will gain by beating down the competition of ours in our own markets."

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, James Monroe, James Madison, Andrew Jackson, and James Buchanan were all protectionists. John C. Calhoun at first was also a protectionist, but in later years was a free trader. But I have no hesitancy in saying that if John C. Calhoun were living to-day he would be a protectionist.

I want to add that in the first instance Daniel Webster was a free trader, but after the tariff act of 1824 and from that time on to his dying day he was a protectionist.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks quotations from the annual messages and writings of those and other distinguished statesmen to show that they were protectionists.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matters indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The messages and writings referred to are as follows:

FIRST PROTECTION PERIOD—1789 TO 1816.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The first subject discussed by the First Congress was the tariff question, and from that day to this it has been the one subject that has never been finally settled. Many subjects of great national importance have been discussed and settled in the intervening years, but the tariff was never a more live and inspiring question than it is at this very hour.

It is well known that the first thing to be done by the First Congress was to regulate the form of the oath to be taken by officials and that it was merely formal, but the first act of that Congress affecting the country was the act establishing a protective tariff, passed and signed by George Washington July 4, 1789.

The discussion lasted for a long period of time, and was participated in by some of the most eminent men of the day, and I am glad to say that as a result of their deliberations they passed a tariff act in the interest of protection and not for "revenue only," for in the preamble to the act occurred these words:

"Whereas it is necessary for the support for the Government, for the discharge of the debt of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufacturers that duties be laid on imported goods, etc.: Therefore be it enacted," and so forth.

It may be remarked in passing that a large majority of that First Congress were farmers, but they saw the necessity of encouraging and protecting manufacturers. Why? In order that they might be free from servile and dangerous dependence upon foreign nations for the arms, the implements of farming, and other machinery needed for their safety, protection, and independence, as have been pointed out by Charles Carroll, Rufus King, Fisher Ames, James Madison, and other great characters that participated in those deliberations.

It will thus be seen that the doctrine of protection to home manufactures—to home products—was coeval with our national organization. It had its enemies then as now, and ever will have, many of them being made up from the importer, the foreigner, and those who sympathize with them, preferring to encourage manufactures, capital, and labor abroad rather than in this country; but of all the men who took a prominent part in the legislation of that hour and made the Revolution a success, and the men who formulated our glorious and splendid Constitution and secured its adoption by the several States, all these voted

for the protective tariff bill and rejoiced when it became a law, as men do in this day and age who want to encourage home industries, encourage the farmer, and see that the laborer is given a fair wage six days in the week.

OPINIONS OF PRESIDENTS AND OTHERS.

It will be interesting to recall that five of these leading men became President while the law of 1789 remained on our statute book, and it may be interesting as well as profitable to know what these great men thought of protection to home manufactures.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

In his first annual message, speaking of our Nation as "A free people," he said: "Their safety and interest require that they promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials, particularly military supplies."

In his seventh annual message he shows that "our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures prosper beyond examples," under the tariff law of 1789. "Every part of the Union displays indications of rapid and various improvement and with burden so light as scarcely to be perceived. Is it too much to say that our country exhibits a spectacle of national happiness never surpassed if ever before equaled?"

Was not this a splendid tribute by the Father of our Country to the first protective tariff act?

In his eighth and last annual message, Washington said: "Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

JOHN ADAMS.

Our second President, in his last annual message, referred to our economic system and congratulated the country upon the great prosperity then existing, and added: "I observe with much satisfaction that the product of the revenue during the present year has been more considerable than during any former period."

"This result affords conclusive evidence of the great resources of the country and of the wisdom and efficiency of the measures which have been adopted by Congress for the protection of commerce and preservation of the public credit."

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

I have already quoted at some length from Thomas Jefferson, our third President, but I want to add the following. In the message sent to Congress by Jefferson on December 15, 1802, he gives approval to the protection of manufactures in the following language:

"To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation, and protect manufactures adapted to our circumstances, etc., are the landmarks by which to guide ourselves in all our relations."

Thomas Jefferson was one of the great defenders of the American system.

In 1809 he wrote to Thomas Leiper, of Philadelphia, as follows:

"I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our own consumption, at least in all articles of which we raise the raw material. On this the Federal papers and meetings have sounded the alarm of the Chinese policy, destruction of commerce, etc. This absurd hue and cry has contributed much to federalize New England; their doctrine goes to the sacrificing agriculture and manufactures to commerce, to the calling all our people from the interior country to a seashore to turn merchants, and to convert this great agricultural country into a city of Amsterdam. But I trust the good sense of our country will see that its greatest prosperity depends on a due balance between agriculture, manufactures, and commerce."

JAMES MADISON.

Our fourth President, recognized as "the father of the Constitution," in a special message to Congress May 23, 1809, said: "It will be worthy of the just and provident care of Congress to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens."

Again, in a special message, February 20, 1815, Mr. Madison said: "But there is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress than a consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and obtained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress."

JAMES MONROE.

Our fifth President, in his inaugural, said: "Our manufacturers will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign market."

In his seventh annual message he says: "Having formerly communicated my views to Congress respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures and the principles on which it should be founded, I have only to add that those views remain unchanged. I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country."

Here you have the views in brief of our first five Presidents and the foremost men of the years in which the tariff act of 1789 was a law.

Do you find any hint of dissatisfaction with protection, any suggestion of a repeal of the law which had wrought such wonders, or any intimation of a modification of the tariff law, except to give them prompt and constant guardianship and consideration and "additional protection to those articles we are prepared to manufacture"?

BENEFITS OF THE TARIFF OF 1789.

I can not refrain from saying a word respecting the glorious results of the first protective tariff act, for agriculture admittedly became more extensive and prosperous, our commerce increased with wonderful rapidity; old industries were revived, as they always are under a protective policy; new ones were built up and established in various parts of the country; our merchant navy was revived and multiplied and all branches of domestic trade were prosperous; our revenue, always an important consideration, soon became sufficient to pay the expenses of the Government and give relief to its creditors; the people again became contented, happy, and industrious, as they have been during the years since the passage of protective laws, beginning in 1897, under the administration of President McKinley, and the whole country seemed to be and was on the high road to great national wealth and prosperity.

There is still another great national character, often spoken of as a patron saint of the Democratic Party, who expressed his views when a United States Senator, in 1824, as follows—what he said very forcibly indicates that he was a strong advocate and supporter of protection:

ANDREW JACKSON.

"Providence," said he, "has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with lead, iron, and copper—and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the greatest materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential in war. We have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and, instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own, or else in a short time by continuing our present policy—that under the tariff of 1816—we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves. It is my opinion, therefore, that a careful and judicious tariff is much wanted."

Hear what President Andrew Jackson said in his annual message, in December, 1832, concerning the results and benefits of eight years of protection under the tariffs of 1824 and 1828: "Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity and happiness unequaled perhaps in any other portion of the world."

I think it will be conceded that the paramount question for a national constitution was demanded by the people of the country because under the Confederation we could not shield our "home industries from the assaults of foreign competition through the regulation of commerce with other nations so as to check or to prohibit the importation of commodities that interfered with the growth and prosperity of domestic manufacturers and so as to give native productions an impetus which would develop all the resources inherent within the boundaries of the Nation essential for the supply and consumption of the population at all times. No fact is more securely established than is this."

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Daniel Webster, historically known as "the Great Expounder of the Constitution," in a speech at Buffalo June, 1833, declared:

"The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution."

Years later Mr. Webster repeated this idea, but much clearer and stronger, in a speech at Albany in August, 1844, when he said:

"In colonial times, and during the time of the convention, the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union, regard to be had in laying this duty to the protection of American labor and industry."

"I defy the man in any degree conversant with the history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, to say that protection of American labor and industry was not a leading, I might almost say the leading, motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted."

I will conclude as to Webster's views upon the subject of protection by quoting what he said respecting the condition of the country that had been realized through the tariffs of 1824 and 1828:

"The relief to the country attained through these tariffs of 1824 and 1828 was profound and general, reaching all classes—the farmer, the manufacturer, the shipowner, the mechanic, and the day laborer. The change was as great as was wrought when Hamilton smote the rock of public credit and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth."

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

President John Quincy Adams, who succeeded Mr. Monroe, was also a strong friend of protection, and in his fourth annual message discusses at some length our agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests, and shows that "all these interests are alike under the protecting power of the legislative authority," and proceeds to make himself clear and explicit in his defense of the principles of protection.

JOHN C. CALHOUN.

It was in 1816 that John C. Calhoun made a strong speech in favor of the protective tariff, in which he said: "When our manufacturers are grown to a certain perfection, as they will under the fostering care of the Government, the farmer will find a ready market for his surplus product, and what is of almost equal importance, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants. His prosperity will diffuse itself to every class in the community. It," a protective tariff, "is calculated to bind together more closely our widespread Republic and give greater nerve to the arm of the Government."

Mr. Calhoun continued to be a protectionist until 1832, when he became a free trader; but with all his commanding ability he was never able to answer his own arguments made as a protectionist.

How can anyone read the utterances of these great men and eminent statesmen, well knowing what protection has done for this country during the last 50 years—developing the most marvelous growth of all nations—without frankly acknowledging that if we are to continue to prosper in the future as we have in the past we need and must have a fair share and measure of protection and not any "tariff for revenue" or "free-trade policy," which during every period that it has been tried in our country's history has proven ruinous and disastrous?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be understood at the beginning that leave has already been granted, and there is no occasion to delay the House in its proceedings by requesting it further.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to what the gentleman has said, that I am anxious to get along with the bill, and I do not want to unduly cut off debate, but I hope gentlemen will confine themselves within the rules to the paragraphs before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, to ask of the gentleman who has charge of the schedule [Mr. HARRISON of New York] a question concerning boracic acid. Under the Payne law borax bears a duty of 2 cents a pound. In this bill it is placed on the free list. Boracic acid, which bore a duty of 3 cents a pound under the

Wilson bill, 5 cents under the Dingley tariff, and 3 cents a pound under the Payne tariff, has now been reduced to three-quarters of a cent a pound. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the schedule what was the underlying philosophy in making that reduction. How was the rate arrived at?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman from Kansas maintain that the reduction on boracic acid is too severe?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know. I am trying to find out.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that the rates of duty as they existed under the Payne law were entirely illogical. The duties that were laid upon the raw material, borax, were laid really for the purpose of making the people in the East pay the freight rates across the continent from the Pacific coast borax mines, and they were not properly balanced in that law with the rates on boracic acid, which is made of borax, and when we put the raw material, crude borates, upon the free list, we made what we thought to be a proper cut in the rates of duty upon boracic acid—to three-quarters of a cent a pound, which is about 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MURDOCK. The old duty on borax, as I understand it, went on away back in the Wilson bill.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I just wanted to know why it was fixed at three-fourths of a cent; why not seven-eighths? How do you arrive at that exact figure? What is the philosophy under which a duty of that kind is laid?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that, in considering every one of the rates in so technical a schedule as Schedule A, regard must be had to the uses to which the different articles are put, to the rates of duty, if any, upon the raw materials, and many other considerations. That is one of the arguments against revision schedule by schedule; that you can not properly balance your tariff rates. Boracic acid is very largely used in manufacturing, in fluxes, in making glass, and so on, and due regard is had for the consumers of the acid as well as for the basis on which the duty on the raw material is fixed.

Mr. MURDOCK. I see you estimate that there will be an importation of 600,000 pounds under this reduction.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is virtually the same importation that took place under the Dingley law in 1905.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the chemical-schedule bill was before the House a year ago it included an item, "benzoic acid, 5 cents a pound." I offered an amendment to restore benzoic acid to the free list, where it is now under the Payne law. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] then declined to accept any proposition to make the rate of duty lower than 5 cents a pound or to put it where it is now, on the free list; but I notice that this item does not carry benzoic acid at 5 cents a pound. So it may be assumed that the arguments then presented, which had no influence upon the committee or the House at that time, have since then sunk deep into the minds of the gentlemen who prepared the bill.

In the bill last year phthalic acid was also on the dutiable list at 5 cents a pound. It is now on the free list. I called attention at that time to the fact, in offering an amendment to restore phthalic acid to the free list, that phthalic acid was used largely in the manufacture of chemical compounds and medicinal preparations. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], who had prepared the bill, denied that statement and said that phthalic acid was used only in the manufacture, I believe, of high-priced coal-tar products. Yet now the gentleman has permitted the information then offered to sink deep into his mind and he leaves phthalic acid off the dutiable list and puts it back on the free list, where we proposed to put it at that time.

In the course of that debate the gentleman insisted that phthalic acid was used for one purpose and I insisted that phthalic acid, in the main, was used for another purpose, and I made this remark:

The situation, however, illustrates the need of having a tariff board to give us accurate information in reference to these matters before we endeavor to enact tariff legislation.

It is true that we have had no tariff board to report upon this since the bill was before the House last year, but even the information furnished in the House at that time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has caused him to recede from his position. Last year he knew that phthalic acid ought to go on the dutiable list at 5 cents a pound, while it is now on the free list.

But in the light of information then furnished to him he now restores phthalic acid to the free list. If we had a tariff commission to furnish information, the gentleman would not have made the mistake in the first place as to this item, and would undoubtedly be able to correct many errors in this bill as to other items. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I would like first to answer the observation of the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Illinois is under a complete misapprehension as to the motives which induced the committee last year to place a tax on various articles and then this year restoring them to the free list. I do not deny that the gentleman from Illinois is an exceedingly well-informed and industrious Member of the House; but I do deny that, like the simple little ostrich, he knows it all. He does not know apparently the reasons that actuated Democrats in laying taxes. Our motives are entirely for raising revenue, and he looks at the matter from an entirely different point of view.

Last year when we brought in Schedule A we were revising the tariff schedule by schedule, and personally I have been opposed to that method of tariff making, because it is impossible to consider one schedule of the tariff without considering at the same time the effect it has upon other schedules. It is impossible in a schedule-by-schedule revision to make what reductions the committee may desire to make, because it produces inconsistencies in other schedules subsequently to come.

When we made our report on Schedule A last year, we had to sacrifice a great deal of revenue in other schedules that theretofore had passed through the House, and the endeavor was made in Schedule A to collect revenues sacrificed in other places. Consequently a number of taxes were laid by the committee on articles that had theretofore been on the free list, and which for the most part were noncompetitive; that is to say, they were chiefly produced in foreign countries, and therefore there was no question of protection connected with them. The gentleman from Illinois, as far as benzoic acid is concerned, is in error again. It has gone into the basket clause at a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. MANN. Which amounts to about 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Making it a proper balance with benzoate of soda that has gone into this bill at 5 cents a pound.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. In Schedule A it is apparent that a very large number of articles have been made dutiable that were hitherto free. Very many persons have been under the impression, because of what they believe to be the Democratic policy, that there was an error on the part of the Ways and Means Committee in placing raw materials on the dutiable list. I would like to ask whether the gentleman is ready to answer if the committee made an error in placing raw materials on the free list, or whether it was intentional?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that so far as I am aware there are no errors in this schedule or elsewhere in the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This was intentional. I will say to the gentleman that if he will study Schedule A as reported now and as reported last year, he will see that since we are now able to complete a whole tariff bill we have not had to resort to sources to collect revenue that we did when we were proceeding schedule by schedule. Consequently we have been able to restore to the free list \$25,000,000 worth of imports upon which we had proposed to levy a tax.

Mr. MOORE. It may save time in offering amendments if we understand and the committee thoroughly understands that it did put raw materials on the dutiable list and that there was no error about it.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Unfortunately we did not have the benefit of the presence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the committee at that time. In spite of that these things were not entirely an error. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I call this matter to the attention of the gentleman now, because the committee has changed its policy with regard to raw materials and has now put many of them on the dutiable list. Is it not true that on page 35 of the report, in a table presented by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, it appears that the committee hopes to raise by a transfer of raw materials from the free list to the dutiable list a total revenue of \$102,000,000?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have not the figures before me, but of course I accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MOORE. Then there has been a change of policy in that in this bill the majority has decided to tax raw materials which enter into the manufactures in this country.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, if I have any time I would like to briefly reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important question.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I shall have to object to that, as we have to run this bill under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Egg albumen, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Last year when the chemical schedule bill was before the House, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], but I suppose properly referred to in one sense as the Harrison bill, it provided for a tax on albumen at 6 cents per pound, the present rate being 3 cents per pound. I offered an amendment to restore albumen to the dutiable list at 3 cents a pound—the existing law—and to not increase it to 6 cents a pound. My distinguished friend from New York strenuously opposed the amendment, and it was defeated, of course, as all amendments we will offer here will be defeated; but yet in the light of the information furnished on the subject this year when the bill comes in it contains the provisions of the amendment which I offered in the House last year, which the gentleman then declined to accept.

I suppose the same excuse will be given now that was given in reference to acids—that in making up a special bill for a special schedule gentlemen found necessity for raising revenue, while in making up the whole bill at once they do not find that necessity. That is a very flimsy excuse. If it was right to put albumen on the dutiable list at 6 cents a pound a year ago, it is right now. It again illustrates the need of information in making up a tariff schedule, information which the committee did not then have and probably would not have had now if we had not called their attention to it last year so that they have looked it up, while if we had had a tariff commission we would have had the information. That is what we stand for over here—information, not ignorance, in making up a tariff bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. What necessity have we for a tariff commission with such an energetic Member the leader of the majority-minority side?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ALLEN] acknowledges he knows nothing about the subject, and does only what he is told by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], we do not assume that all information is contained within the skull of either the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], or both combined, and I might say also, including that of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ALLEN], though I do not think he would add much to the information. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], of course we all know that our friend from Illinois, the distinguished leader of the opposition, is always right; at least, is always right in his own opinion; but your committee does not suffer from this peculiar disease. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] We know that we are human and that any committee that drafts a revenue bill, except a Republican committee, is likely to make mistakes at times. This committee, if it makes a mistake, is perfectly willing to come out here on the floor of the House at any time and say so and make a correction for the good of the country. I do not know, I am not willing to say, that we made any mistakes in these particular items last year; that is, any mistake in the way of a serious mistake. This schedule is a very involved schedule and a very technical one. Last year we were endeavoring to make these various schedules as we were amending the tariff bill, schedule by schedule, produce in the neighborhood of as much revenue as the present law produces, and at the same time reduce the rates for the benefit of the American people.

Of course, amending the bill schedule by schedule and attempting to make each schedule balance the revenue we were handicapped to that extent in properly adjusting our rate. This year,

when we had the opportunity to write a large portion of the taxes of the country against the great wealth of the United States, we have not suffered from the same trouble. We have got a full bill. We can get our revenue from any schedule or any portion of the bill, and necessarily we have made a number of changes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not right now. We have made these changes, particularly the changes the gentlemen have referred to, because we no longer needed the revenue from this schedule and could place it somewhere else; but I am free to say that so far as this committee is concerned, or this end of the committee is concerned, we do not bring the bill before the country with the censure of the Republican committees in the past, who had learned their lesson from the protected manufacturers and who always claimed upon the floor of this House that everybody else was ignorant and that they were always right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I say to the gentleman from Illinois that we do not propose to let you write this bill, because it is our business and we are responsible to the country; but should information come, even from the gentleman from Illinois, this committee will welcome it most gladly, and if we think you are right we will accept it.

Mr. MANN. Next year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress went before the country with the statement that the only scientific way in which a tariff bill could be enacted was schedule by schedule. They led the country to believe that if a tariff bill was reported as a whole an amount of logrolling could be engaged in between Members of Congress which would enable them to secure a sufficient number of votes for schedules in which Members did not believe, in order that they might get the things they wanted in the schedules in which they did believe, and so they led the country to believe, or tried to do so, that this was an iniquitous way to enact tariff legislation. Now when they are in complete control of the Government they come to Congress with a bill which does the thing which they said should not be done. They engage in secret conclaves and drive every man into line for every item in every paragraph in this bill, regardless of whether he thinks it is just or not, and now give us to understand that they can not properly balance the rates in the tariff schedules and regulate the income in separate bills, but that in order to harmonize the revenue with the rates and do no injustice to any interest—and at the same time not lose any votes—they now bring a bill in with all the schedules tied together. The American people believed what the Democrats said before the election, when they said the thing to do was to pass tariff legislation schedule by schedule, where no combinations could be made to secure votes for any item in the schedule that did not have merit in it, and a great many of the people voted for the Democratic Party because they believed what they said, and now they are proceeding to prove to the people that they did not mean what they said by coming to the House with a bill that in many particulars is iniquitous and with every Democrat in the House bucked and gagged to vote for it whether right or wrong.

I am very glad they do this, because it is what they always do whenever they get into power, and the people might as well know early in these proceedings that whenever Democrats gain power they will always be certain to do the wrong thing. Tariff legislation should be passed upon its merits. Every schedule should be submitted separately. If that were done, many men here, regardless of politics, would vote for many of the schedules suggested regardless of who suggested the schedules.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Did the gentleman participate in the Republican caucus that considered the Payne bill?

Mr. MADDEN. No; there was no caucus.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, what did you call it—a conference?

Mr. MADDEN. No; there was neither a conference nor a caucus. It was considered on the floor of the House in the open light of day and every man in the United States could see what was being done without glasses.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not true that the Republican side of the House was so gagged and bound at that time that a caucus was not necessary? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I would just like to have time to say one word. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] always tries to be spectacular, regardless of whether there is any merit in what he has to say or not.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will be heard in opposition to the motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, in reference to what has just been said, I wish to say I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] that during the consideration of the Payne bill the House was bound by a gag rule and bound in exactly the same way that the Democratic majority to-day is bound by a caucus rule, and there is no difference. Now, Mr. Chairman, the purpose for which I rose was in reference to a statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that even now, at this time, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] should be able to furnish to the Democratic side information that some mistake had been made or that they had been wrong in some particular with reference to this bill, that even at this time they were willing to correct the mistake; and I would like, and I know this side would like, and the country would like, a little further explanation from the gentleman from Alabama with regard to that question. It is the understanding of this side, it is the understanding of the country, that the Democratic side has in caucus settled the fate of this bill; that you are not at liberty to vote for a single amendment, however meritorious, that may be proposed to this bill. And I want to ask the gentleman from Alabama now whether, if amendments are proposed upon this side that appeal to his judgment, that appeal to the judgment of the Democratic side of this aisle, whether they are now at liberty to vote for those amendments or whether it will be necessary before they shall be at liberty to do so to take this bill back again into secret caucus and pass upon the proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman yield? My time has expired, and I did not propose to extend any time.

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman candidly that this side is responsible to the country and that that side of the House has been repudiated by the country. This side of the House has been commissioned to write this bill. In a free and open and ungagged caucus we have written the bill that we present to the country as a bill of this side of the House. We are responsible for it, and the country does not expect you to legislate.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman answer this question? He did state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that even at this time they were willing to correct the bill if it was wrong in some particular; and I want to ask the gentleman whether he is willing, if an amendment is proposed that appeals to his judgment, or appeals to the judgment of Members on that side of the aisle, whether they are at liberty to vote for the amendment, or whether his statement to the gentleman from Illinois was correct or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will yield, I will make the statement to him.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has been authorized fully to offer such amendments as they see proper. I do not expect that side of the House to show us any mistakes in the bill, because they confess their ignorance, and say they need a tariff commission to advise them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I will say to the gentleman that we are perfectly prepared and able, if an error is presented to us that appeals to our judgment, to lay it before the House at any time during this debate, coming from the Ways and Means Committee, who are the agents of this side of the House, and the House will have an opportunity to vote on it. But I would have to be shown before I yielded to the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. If an amendment, then, is presented which appeals to a Democrat who is not a member of the Ways and Means Committee, is he at liberty to vote for it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He has appointed his agents, and his agents are acting for him. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, the majority leader [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has just stated "that his party has framed the tariff bill and is responsible to the country for it," and "that the country has repudiated that side of the House," meaning by that to convey the idea that all except the Democrats have been repudiated.

The majority leader has been a Member of Congress a long time. He is now a great leader. Under all conditions he is courteous and considerate, both to his supporters and to those who work from a different viewpoint and in opposition to him. With his party in power and backing him, he can easily push forward to accomplish the results that he fights for. He

is really a great man, and I gladly acknowledge my respects, but I differ with him on the methods that should be adopted in the administration of the Government. He believes that the Nation should be governed by a party. That, in my judgment, is wrong. The party is always smaller than the Nation and should not dominate the Nation. And yet party government is the "nominal" form that has been practiced for a long time. But I am certain that the self-interest of the people, as well as national pride, once the people realize how much party government robs them of their rights, will repudiate any party that usurps the national powers and sets itself up as responsible and prevents the people's representatives generally from effectively performing their duties.

The Nation most certainly should govern itself, because that is the fundamental basis on which it is organized. That is why I arose to criticize the statement of the majority leader. He has no right to say that the Democratic Party is alone responsible for legislation, nor that those Members who are not Democrats have been repudiated.

No person holding a seat in Congress has been repudiated. Every Member has a constituency, and could not be in Congress except by his election, which directly refutes the idea of repudiation. Furthermore, a candidate may even be defeated without its meaning his repudiation, because we all know that only one of several candidates for the same office can be elected, even though all may have the confidence of the people.

The President, Mr. Wilson, has taken no such view as that expressed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, for only a few days since, he delivered a speech in his home State and announced that the country had not declared itself for Democracy, basing his statement on the fact that he had not received a majority of the votes cast for President.

I positively oppose the Government being dominated by any political party. I stand for an effective National Government with every representative selected by the people acting for his constituency unbridled by any party. As long as I live I shall fight for a government to be controlled by the people for themselves. Political parties came in and usurped the power of the Government, because domineering men wanted to control, and party division enabled them to do that. It divided the people, so that the bosses could whip one party with the other, and then the successful party would divide into factions, and the strongest would whip the weakest, and then offer the inducement of "party harmony" and get submission. In that way the Government has been run by a few bosses principally for themselves.

The bosses, of course, are very suave in their arguments and in their demeanor. They must play a smooth game in order that the people shall not know that in truth it is the political party government of Congress that has made it possible for a few persons to control the wealth of this country.

The rich get hearings here in Congress. They come themselves as well as send their agents and their attorneys to frame things up to their advantage; but the plain working people, farmers and others, neither can come themselves nor can they send agents or attorneys to represent them. When their representatives in Congress fail to represent and protect their rights, then they get no representation. That is just what party government amounts to. Party government is factional government. That is why things are so one-sided—a few rich, many poor. It will continue to be so as long as the people flock to party banners that are carried by party bosses.

The tariff bill that is being read was passed by the Ways and Means Committee first. In point of effect the bill was prepared by 14 members on that committee. I count the Democrats only, because the others were not permitted to have any effective representation. Seven of the 14 are from the South, and its chairman is from the South. In fact, the South, with a comparatively small portion of the country's population and resources, controls the committee. The South controls practically all of the committees. That statement is not made with the slightest disrespect toward the South nor toward the gentlemen on the committee. I do not believe that there is a material difference in the morals and intelligence of any one section of country that distinguishes it from others. Human nature is practically the same in them all.

It is quite natural for all people to be self-interested. They take care of themselves first and are generous when it pays to be so. That is the way it has always worked out in human affairs. That is the way it works out in this bill. Politics have, of course, played a prominent figure in the bill, as they always will when the Government is run by party bosses. On that account some schedules have been modified for expedience; but, taken as a whole, the bill is most favorable to the South and to the large cities. If the two can be held together for one

party government it would assure that party success. The hopes of party leaders that that may be the case can be read from this bill and also in the appointment of committees of Congress. The farmers have not had their interests equally protected, and the tariff bill as a whole, in my judgment, is unfavorable to them and to the towns and villages supported directly by the farming industry.

The second step for the bill was to pass it through the Democratic caucus. That is a self-appointed, unofficial body, and it owes no official responsibility to the people. It works in secret. Its real purpose is to harmonize the party organization, so that a few bosses may run the whole party and likewise control the Nation. When the bill got out of the caucus fuse and upon the floor of the House there was not a Democrat with backbone enough to talk or vote against a single item except when, for expediency in a few cases, the political bosses permitted it for the sole purpose of fooling the constituency of some Member.

If there had been even 50 of the Democrats who had supported the Constitution and the laws of the land and had fought for the adoption of a bill by the membership of the House unshackled, we would have gotten a very much better bill. If this House was given an opportunity to legislate instead of letting the bosses legislate by trading committee appointments and trafficking in patronage, all of which the people pay for, Members could be satisfied that their constituencies had at least been represented. But under the present system they have not.

This play that we are going through now is a farce. The bill was passed by the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, and then to harmonize the party elements it was put through the caucus furnace with slight changes, as a matter of form, resulting as it is now before the House. But it was settled as to what would be done with it in the House before it was allowed to come upon the floor of the House. Only perfunctory amendments can be made to cover clerical errors and things previously forgotten. If anyone proposed a material amendment that seemed to make a few Democrats doubt and hesitate as to what they should do, you would not dare to let the House settle it, but would call a caucus to fuse the doubtful ones in the caucus furnace.

You Democrats are no more to be criticized for that system than the Republicans who preceded you, except that you ought to have learned by their bad examples to have avoided it. Republicans probably would not make the same mistake again.

You say that the House is too large a body to legislate. Well, that is what political bosses said when there were less Members in Congress than now attend your Democratic caucus, but I do not hear it said that your caucuses are too large to legislate. Anyone who knows anything at all about it knows that this body is larger than it should be, but large as it is it can legislate as one of the Houses of Congress better than it can by dividing into unofficial groups and having one caucus do all of the legislating that the bosses order.

I am not here to defend any political party. This Congress does not belong to a party. Congress belongs to the people, and when they run it as their own the Members sent here will legislate for the people. It will never be done before.

You Democrats have promised to make good times by tariff tinkering. You have promised a lower cost of living. It is the same old fake promise that all parties make about something or other in order to get into power. I wonder how long it will take people generally to learn that no party, acting as such in Congress, can bring prosperity. When we get good times—the kind of times that the natural resources, coupled with their development by the people for themselves, would give—it will be when political party lines have been wiped out and favoritism ceases and Congress is run on a business plan instead of as an incubation plant for developing political parasites.

Just think of a promise to make better times by tinkering with the tariff. Do you think that the people of some other land are going to feed and clothe us? We are more prosperous than any of them are, and still the delusion is held out that we shall have good times if we revise the tariff. I do not question that the tariff ought to be revised and revised downward. It ought, however, to be done impartially, which is not the case with this bill and will not be the case with any bill that is prepared in the way that this one was. It is the system by which the bill has been prepared that is wrong.

We never can get the tariff even temporarily right by the present system, and I am not particularly stuck on the kind of tariff board that has been proposed, though I am not opposed to such, for it can do some good work that must be done, anyway. But the tariff, as long as we have it, should be managed by some automatic system, so that it may be adjusted to the neces-

sities as changes in conditions arise. These changes occur continually, and the tariff, as long as it exists as a system, is properly an administrative measure, and should be under the management of some authority responsible to the people for its administration, which should be regulated by laws made by Congress, but without the necessity of Congress entering into the details, which it has shown itself incapable of handling well.

The income-tax provision in the bill is a long step in the right direction. I believe that the tax on large incomes should have been more, but that is a matter of detail that can easily be remedied in the future. There are other provisions in the bill that deserve commendation. Considering the false method in which the bill has been prepared, I must say that it is a better bill than would ordinarily come out of such a proceeding. I think the moral influence of the President, together with the good intention of most of your Members, is responsible for that. With the bill already passed by your caucus you are wasting time here in the House by not bringing in a rule to pass it without a farcical discussion here on the floor. You know that the caucus has tied your hands, and why not admit it and pass the bill without further cost to the country so that it may at once be sent to the Senate? Of course, some Members wish to get up and make a showing that they have tried to do something with it, but that amounts to absolutely nothing under the circumstances.

I think it will be admitted by any thinking person who has ever studied the subject that the only sure road to prosperity for the people is one that they will have to make for themselves. No foreign people are going to feed and clothe us. We shall have to do that for ourselves, and I believe that the most of us wish to do that. The most of us know that it is just as easy, and perhaps more so, to form combinations for the control of prices in other countries as it is in this. Furthermore, we know that whenever there is a prospect of making profits out of such combinations that selfish parties will be on hand to make them. The only way to be assured of prosperity in our own country is to properly regulate the affairs that are wholly within our own jurisdiction and control.

It is not enough to simply promise times as good as the best we have ever had. Nor is it enough to even promise times that would be better than any that have been. What we should do is to take an inventory of our resources and advantages wherever they are and bring about an application of human energy to secure for the people in general the kind of good times that are available when we make use of the advantages.

People work hard, so hard that most of them have not had time to learn the conditions that govern them, and therefore they do not realize what great advantages exist for bettering their conditions. By taking advantage of the natural resources and making use of the great mechanical devices and of the best methods of application, they could reduce the hours of their toil easily by one-half and increase their resources more than double. Those persons who have accumulated great wealth prove that they have known the facts in this regard, and have applied their own energy in supplementing it thousands of fold by appropriating the products of other people's energy. The people have worked hard to create that wealth, but they do not control it. It is, in fact, a tax upon them because those who possess it are allowed to and do charge them enormous profits for the privilege of using it, and besides, under the present system, it really controls the industries. The degree of the people's success in the future will be determined by the extent of their knowledge of the truth about these facts. They can not be generally successful as long as they permit others to appropriate the best results of their energy.

The future social betterment of men and women must come through their own intelligence, and that intelligence must be exercised and expressed through their votes. There is no moral, natural, or social distinction separating the men from the women in this right and duty, nor in the interests they have, to vote. When they shall join their common interests and also obliterate all party government, the people will be able to solve their own problems, but as long as they permit a few bosses supported by a faction of a party to run the party as well as the Government, more and more burdensome problems will arise to tax them.

Really, I do not see anything of which the politicians long in service had to brag about. To start with, the territory comprising these United States in its original creation is not excelled in the richness of its resources in all the world. Here it was, the property of all people, dedicated to them by God's glorious creation. The showers and sunshine and the seasons have come and gone in regular succession to keep nature in constant response to the demands of men. Nothing has been

lacking in the supreme forces out of which all things may come that men require for a utilization to the advantages of all of them. Thus, we realize that no fault occurs in nature. All that men had to do to be prosperous was to establish a good government and administer it properly and be industrious themselves.

Surely no one will complain that we have not had the proper natural advantages. But that is not all. Since we first came into national existence discoveries have been made in the way of utilizing our individual energies to make our industry more productive. The various inventions of mechanical application and discoveries in regard to chemical results and the means by which natural forces are harnessed may be made to work in the production of things necessary and in the establishment of conditions desirable for people generally. The good that would come from all these if properly handled would be enormous. But with nature responding at its best, and with the genius of the period of our national existence at its highest, still we have not succeeded in giving to people in general advantages that are anywhere near the equivalent of what is due to them out of the advantages that have existed.

It has not been due to nature's failure nor to the lack of inventive genius that people generally have not been able to secure better results. Neither has it been due to any failure of industriousness on the people's part, for they have been industrious. The actual production of material wealth shows that to be so. Therefore we can look to neither of those conditions as unfavorable. There is but one thing left to which to charge the failure, and that is the political management. It has been managed by party bosses. They are fine gentlemen, but very expensive to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

5. Alkalies, alkaloids, and all chemical and medicinal compounds, preparations, mixtures and salts, and combinations thereof not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "section," strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is a compromise between the rate of the Payne bill and the rate of the so-called Underwood bill of the last Congress. The Payne bill gave a protection of 25 per cent. The Dingley bill gave a protection of 25 per cent. The Wilson bill gave a protection of 25 per cent, and we ask that this industry be given at least the same protection that the Wilson bill afforded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

6. Alizarin, natural or synthetic, dry or suspended in water, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. If the motion prevails, as I suppose it will [laughter on the Republican side], in the light of the last statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I shall offer a motion when the free list is reached to place this item on the free list.

Alizarin is now on the free list. It is a dyestuff, as indigo is a dyestuff; a fast dye. I believe that at one time indigo, in connection with this bill, was placed on the dutiable list and in the caucus or somewhere was restored to the free list. This bill proposes to reduce the rates of duty on articles produced by the aid of alizarin where alizarin is used as a dye. It proposes to add to the dutiable list this dyestuff, which is now on the free list.

Of course, it is very well to say that this item is to raise revenue, and that the item reducing the duties on the finished product is to give the consumer the benefit. But that is cutting off at both ends.

This is one of the amendments which I offered a year ago. I regret that the committee did not have time to investigate this subject and place alizarin, along with indigo, on the free list, where both belong.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] a few moments ago, indulging in the same kind of cheap talk which is occasionally indulged in by Members not so responsible in

authority as he is, said that I was very certain of the amendments which I offered; that I claimed perfect knowledge upon the subject. I do not do that, although I congratulate the majority side of the House that as to a number of the amendments to which I shall call attention, offered by me a year ago, the gentlemen now admit that I was right then by accepting propositions which we made from our side of the House.

They say they have gained information. Very well. Then they rejected the information placed before the House. Then they refused to accept the amendments, as they will refuse now to accept any amendment affecting the tariff rates offered from this side of the House, regardless of the merits. It will take the gentlemen a year to find out, as it has taken them a year to digest a portion of the information offered from this side of the House a year ago. Where they have digested the information they have applied it to this bill, and if they were wise they would now accept the amendments proposed and place this necessary raw material, so far as coloring is concerned, upon the free list along with indigo.

I wonder that alizarin did not have some special friend in the Democratic caucus as indigo had, whereby alizarin would have been placed on the free list along with indigo, which was placed on the free list through the personal efforts of gentlemen who were interested in friends who were interested in the manufacture of indigo. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult indeed to satisfy the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The last time he was on his feet he was complaining because he claimed we had adopted an amendment proposed by him.

Mr. MANN. No; I congratulated the gentleman, instead of complaining.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now the gentleman is on his feet complaining that we have not adopted another amendment which he proposed. The gentleman from Illinois is entirely in error in saying that because of information supplied by him the committee have restored to the free list certain items which they taxed last year. He sometimes does supply information, but for the most part he supplies declamation. When these items were before the House last year he did not give us any information about them. The only reason why we taxed them then and do not tax them now is because we were then looking for sources of raising revenue which are now rendered unnecessary by the adoption of the income tax by the Democratic Party, which gives us the opportunity to raise the funds a part of which we had to resort to formerly in this chemical schedule.

Now, alizarin is not on exactly the same footing as indigo. The gentleman's argument in favor of putting alizarin on the free list would apply with equal force to putting all coal-tar dyes and products on the free list. I would like to see all the things that the manufacturers of woolen and cotton buy go upon the free list if we could dispense with the revenues that we raise from them; but we have got to raise the revenues to run this Government in part from tariff rates, and so long as we are obliged to do so I would like to see the revenues raised from articles like alizarin, which are not produced in the United States, which are produced entirely in foreign countries, so that no question of protecting anybody comes in when we levy a rate of 10 per cent upon alizarins. Now, indigos are used for dyeing the cheapest kind of blue cloths. Alizarins, on the other hand, are the most expensive kind of red dyes. The interest of the consumer might appeal to us to leave indigo upon the free list, while the same interest would not appeal to us to put alizarin upon the free list. The price of alizarin has fallen nearly 20 per cent in the last few months, and this 10 per cent tax that we propose upon alizarin will not burden the manufacturers of this country in comparison to the prices they recently paid for alizarin. The probability is that even with this tax they will be able to buy alizarin cheaper than they have bought it up to date.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. From the viewpoint of the consumer of carpets, this duty on alizarin will increase the cost of living. There is a German combination that controls alizarin. It is manufactured in Switzerland and Germany. There is none of it manufactured in the United States. A gentleman who was a very pronounced Progressive in the last campaign, who is a manufacturer of carpets, but who wanted some changes in the tariff duties of the Payne law, writes me that it looks to him as if the framers of the Underwood bill did not know what they were doing in putting the duties upon dyestuffs, which have been free, and which still further handicap the American manufacturers.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Pennsylvania might be spared the effort of making this argument if he knew that not a single pound of alizarin is used in making carpets.

Mr. MOORE. I understand it enters into the dyestuffs that go into the manufacture of certain carpets, and that the John & James Dobson Co., who employ 5,000 men in their textile works in Philadelphia, have sued the combination which controls this product, under the Sherman antitrust law, for damages amounting to \$400,000. If the Democratic Party think that by now imposing duties upon raw materials they are going to reduce the cost of living they will find that in imposing these duties upon raw materials that are not made in the United States they are simply adding a tax to the consumers of the product and also destroying the labor which enters into the construction of the product in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn; and the question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. This is a sort of test.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division.

The committee divided, and there were 83 yeas and 138 yeas. So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

9. Argols or crude tartar or wine lees crude or partly refined, containing not more than 90 per cent of potassium bitartrate, 5 per cent ad valorem; containing more than 90 per cent of potassium bitartrate, cream of tartar, and Rochelle salts or tartrate of soda and potassa, 2½ cents per pound; calcium tartrate crude, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph puts argols or crude tartar or wine lees on the dutiable list at 5 per cent. That is the rate of tax by the existing law. The bill a year ago carried the rate at 10 per cent. I offered an amendment to restore the rate to 5 per cent, which amendment has now been accepted by the committee. I gave the reasons then for offering the amendment, and after the reasons were stated the distinguished gentleman from Alabama made this statement in regard to the amendment to the paragraph carrying argols at 10 per cent:

Mr. Chairman, I will only take up the time of the committee for a few moments, and this paragraph illustrates as clearly as any in this bill the dividing line between a Republican tariff bill, written in the interest of certain manufacturers, and a Democratic tariff bill, written in the interest of the Government and the consumer.

And yet they now accept the amendment I then offered and which the gentleman from Alabama said then clearly illustrated the difference between a tariff bill written by Republicans in the interest of the manufacturers and a tariff bill written in the interest of the consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Pray tell me whether this bill, with the acceptance of the proposition made a year ago, is now written in the interest of the manufacturers? The gentleman said a year ago that the proposition then offered, now written into this bill, was in the interest of the manufacturers against the interest of the consumer, and illustrated as clearly as anything in the bill the dividing line between the bill written for the manufacturer and the bill written for the consumer.

The gentleman has abandoned his dividing line; he has abandoned his claim that the bill was written in the interest of the consumer, because now he writes into the bill the very thing which he said then was in the interest of the manufacturer and clearly showed the dividing line. I wonder where the dividing line is now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois has read my speech and pointed out the situation. Of course I do not expect the gentleman from Illinois ever to recognize the dividing line between the great masses of the American people and the great corporations for whom that side of the House always legislates. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

But, as I have stated before, a year ago we wrote a 10 per cent tax on argols, a noncompetitive product—a product that came into this country and was purchased entirely by the manufacturing interests. We levy a tax on these representatives of wealth. These manufacturers are great representatives of wealth. We increased their taxes 10 per cent in order that we might rid the taxes in this bill on soap and paints and other

products that the poorer people of the United States have to use. To-day we have shifted that tax from these particular manufacturers to the income tax, where it falls on the backs of the rich. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Of course the gentleman from Illinois is unable to differentiate between the propositions, but as I told him a year ago, we were not here to exempt from taxation great manufacturing interests of the country if the taxes were just, but when we have an opportunity to levy these taxes in another place, and levy them more effectively, we prefer to levy them through an income tax than to levy them on their raw products. That is the whole proposition. The gentleman from Illinois, I have no doubt, holds a commission from the special interests in this country which my friends on that side of the House always champion. Why, they were shocked a year ago that we should tax anything that a corporation wanted to buy. We did not hesitate to do so when it was necessary for us to tax them to relieve taxation on the necessities of life. All through this bill, of course, the gentleman, I have no doubt, believes himself that it was solely due to his eloquence and his logic and his persuasion that it was necessary for us to untax these corporate products. But I can assure the gentleman that there are a number of cases in Schedule A where we have untaxed the manufacturer at the gate of his factory, but we have laid the tax on the net income of his corporation that falls at his office if not at the gate of his factory. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] from many standpoints. My regard for him as an inventor has increased greatly in the last few days. He invented and copyrighted the so-called competitive tariff proposition. He has now invented, and I suppose will copyright, an entirely new proposition of representative government, and in order to properly carry out his new principle it will be necessary to somewhat modify the oath we all recently took at the bar of the House to something like this:

I do solemnly promise to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, provided I am instructed by my agents, the Ways and Means Committee, so to do.

He announces to us what none of you gentlemen would be frank enough to do, that you have entirely waived your duties, responsibilities, and obligations, and transferred them in toto, en bloc, to the gentleman from Alabama. How unwise you are in doing that is illustrated by a few remarks the gentleman from Alabama just made on the matter under discussion. You are to follow him because he is the fountain of knowledge and information, particularly when he proceeds to tell you that they have retained the same duty on argols and wine lees that is now contained in the Payne law in order to make soap cheaper. Soap! Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Alabama has consulted his experts to no better purpose generally than in this case—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not misquote me. I did not make any such statement. I said that we increased the tax on argols because we wanted to reduce the tax on soaps. There was no connection in the sentence.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has not reduced the tax on argols. He has retained the tax just as it was. He increased it a year ago. Now, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] he has placed it back to the present duty, and if he did not intend us to understand that it was in order to enable him to reduce the price of soap, why did he say so, for he discussed the matter in the same connection and without a single pause. Argols, wine lees, if the gentleman would like to know, I understand—and I am not an expert in the matters and have not consulted the experts—are used for the making of cream of tartar and like products. I never heard of their being used for the manufacture of soap, and yet the high and mighty authority to whom you on the other side have transferred all of your responsibilities insist that you shall resist any proposition to change the duty on argols because you are trying to reduce the price of soap. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand the objection that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has to our having reduced the duty upon soap. There is a great big housecleaning going on in the Republican Party now, and they need plenty of soap. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman hear me say anything in the way of complaint about the reduction of the duty on soap?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to be very much exercised over the fact that we are going to let more soap into the country, but he has entirely misconstrued the statements of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr.

UNDERWOOD]. The gentleman from Alabama knows, even though the gentleman from Wyoming does not seem to know, that argols are not used for making soap. They are used for making cream of tartar and tartaric acid, things that go into the textile trades, and also into the manufacture of baking powder. We have reduced the duties upon these latter things, we have nearly cut them in two, for they are the things that the consumers buy. The consumer does not buy argols. The only people who buy argols are manufacturers of cream of tartar and tartaric acid, and when we reduce the tax this year from 10 per cent in our bill of last year to 5 per cent in this bill, in the matter of the collection of revenue we had to give up \$150,000; but we did it, as the gentleman from Alabama has so well stated, because we have the income tax to resort to now.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

10. Balsams: Copaiba, fir or Canada, Peru, tolu, and all other balsams, which are natural and uncomounded and not suitable for the manufacture of perfumery and cosmetics, if in a crude state, not advanced in value or condition by any process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the balsams and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; if advanced in value or condition by any process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the balsams and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hold in my hand an editorial taken from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Thursday, April 24, 1913, in which an attempt is made to explain the reason why the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee has no comprehension of the industrial conditions of the country, as shown by the Underwood bill, and, among other things, in that editorial the following statement is made:

Of the 14 Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee—the only members of that committee permitted even to learn of any of the details of the new tariff bill until it was presented to the Democratic caucus—the men who framed this tariff in secret and refused to hear suggestions or advice from anyone outside of their membership, 9 are country lawyers. The record of each is closely identical with that of the others. After service as prosecuting attorney in some small county, in an agricultural district which had seen little or no progress for a generation, each was elected to Congress.

One comes from Sherman, Tex., a town of 12,412 inhabitants; 1 from Brunswick, Ga., a town of 10,182 inhabitants; 1 from Jefferson City, Mo., a town of 11,859 inhabitants; 1 from Scotland Neck, N. C., with less than 2,500 inhabitants; 1 from Carrollton, Ill., less than 2,500 people; 1 from Mount Vernon, Ind., 2,915; 1 from Carthage, Tenn., a village of some 600; 1 from St. James, Minn., less than 2,500; and 1 from Stroudsburg, Pa., 4,379. These 9 village lawyers constituted rather more than two-thirds of the committee which framed a measure which will directly affect every man employed in manufacturing and in commerce throughout the whole United States. How well qualified they are by education, by past experience, and by the environment which surrounded them until their entrance into Congress can be judged by the simple facts recorded above.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I wondered if the editor knew that Abraham Lincoln came from a town of less than 10,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and he knew that Abraham Lincoln was not a Democrat. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. He would also know that Abraham Lincoln could not be a Republican if he were living now.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have often heard it said, and I have no doubt men now here present have heard the same, that the great and successful men in the business, commercial, and professional world, and in fact all walks of our life, are the men who have come from the country or small towns. The statement of the gentleman from Washington is a further demonstration of that being true, and it is due to that fact that we have the great and able men who have prepared this tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn; the gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, after the word "balsams," strike out to and including the word "valorem" in lines 18 and 19.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, after going to school upon this schedule at the last session, I will admit that the Democratic majority have considerably improved Schedule A,

but, unfortunately, although they had such able tutelage under the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] they did not follow all of his suggestions, and, in my judgment, here is one particular in which that schedule needs and ought to be amended. The part which I have asked to have stricken out refers to crude balsams used in medicinal compounds for the purpose of alleviating coughs, and which are largely used by the poorer classes. It is a tax, pure and simple, upon necessities which were heretofore on the free list. There is no need for it and there is no use for it and it ought to be taken off this schedule.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, the statement read by the gentleman from Washington is the most characteristic and candid utterance of the spirit of Republicanism heard within the walls of this Chamber in 20 years. His boldness is as amazing as his candor. We long have known that they upon that side believe that all virtue, all power, and all wisdom reside in the great financial centers, and was to be found only among the enormously rich in the great cities. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are told that the Ways and Means Committee is incompetent, because we come from towns no larger than those in which Washington and Jefferson, Madison and Monroe once found an abode. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are told that you must go to the great marts where your Harrimans, your Fricks, and your Morgans, and the other patron saints of Republicanism hold absolute dominion and implore those high gods the privilege to write the laws of the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am from a small town; yea, verily, and I glory in it. I am the representative of a rural population, and I thank God for it. It is natural, it is inevitable, that they who believe the farmer, the small merchant, should be fed with a spoon from the hands of the millionaire enriched by a Republican Ways and Means Committee and Republican tariff should look from the soil, the source of all wealth and the abode of virtue, to the great city, to the office of the broker and the factory of the tariff baron, to find the source of prosperity and plenty. We upon this side look out upon the spreading fields, blessed by God's sunshine and His dew, and when there is an abundant harvest, when there is prosperity among the toiling masses, when the farmer and the small laborer join in one grand chorus of hope and content, then will you find prosperity deserved and earned even among the mighty rich. But when their millions are wrung from the sweat and toil and misery of the unnumbered masses, when their palaces are built upon the ruins of ramshackling huts, upon the ruined fortunes and the blasted hopes of a people, when their factories are filled with the pauper labor of Europe, from which the American has been exiled, in such an hour it ill becomes the defenders of plunder to turn upon us in the country and in the small towns with the cold and pitiless sneer that we are ignorant and poor and ought to be oppressed. I am here to say it is indeed a truth to the leathern conscience and blind perceptions of Republicanism, but it is a slander and a lie to the nobler impulses and clearer vision of the spirit of Democracy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman who has just spoken so eloquently that while he states that the broad fields of the country are blessed with God's sunshine that if you pass this bill there is nothing else that can bless them in the bill?

If you rob the farmer, whom he has so eloquently defended, of all the protection he has heretofore enjoyed from our tariff laws, and if you keep up the protection for these great city interests that you attack, what can the farmer expect except economic enslavement and disaster? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will be withdrawn.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Having grown up on a farm, never having lived since my early youth for any length of time, before my election to Congress, in a town of more than 2,000 people. I am in sympathy with the eloquent tribute paid by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], always eloquent, and never so eloquent as when he gets to soaring among the clouds to the farmer. And when I think of the farmers of Ohio and the farmers of Michigan and the farmers of the great mountain West, whose sheep and wool business is to be destroyed by this bill; when I think of the farmers who are now contributing to the wealth of Louisiana through the growth of sugar; when I think of the farmers in the beet-raising regions all over the country, whose industry is condemned by this legislation, I wonder the gentleman from Kentucky, with all his fine sympathy for the farmer, has not indicated it in opposition to this legislation.

The fact that the gentlemen who framed this bill come from small towns is no proper criticism of them, providing they had the breadth of view to realize the fact that only under proper protection of the industries of the country everywhere can the farmer and the dweller in the small town, as well as in the city, prosper. The difficulty was not that the members of the committee come from small towns but that they were small and limited in their knowledge, in their view, and in many instances that limitation of information and of view redounds to the benefit of the manufacturers of the great cities, for there are items in this bill, which, taking into consideration the benefits the manufacturer receives through free raw material, leave him with a larger aggregate of protection on his manufactured products than he now has in the Payne bill. On the other hand, there is scarcely a product of the farm, there is scarcely an industry of the small town that this bill will not paralyze or destroy. And I appeal to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], who loves the farmer, who sympathizes with the toiler in the country places, as I do, to vote against this bill, which, while whatever its effect may be upon the manufacturing industries of the Nation, will put the greatest blight and the heaviest burdens upon the farmers and the dwellers in the small towns of the Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is recognized in opposition.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman who has just addressed you has told you of his birth upon the farm, while the record shows he was born in that vast and fertile region known as St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is as accurate as he often is. I did not say I was born on a farm. I said I grew up on a farm. I got out of the city and onto the farm as soon as I could, at the age of 7.

Mr. STANLEY. Well, he must have learned most of his farming before the age of 7. [Laughter.] The corn he saw was on sale in St. Louis, and the only plow he knows anything about is the plow of a street car, and his consistency in discussing farming as he learned in St. Louis is even more edifying than his tribute to liberty and freedom as learned from Joe Cannon. There is nothing more unique in its absurd incongruity than this assault the standpatters are now making on the tyranny of the Ways and Means Committee. Why, it will take another year of growth of hair before the mark of Cannon's collar will be off of their necks. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The stoop has not left their bowed forms, the result of 10 long years of crawling into anterooms to ask the once despotic Speaker for the power to introduce a bill or advocate a measure. And now out of that loathsome house of bondage, in a hopeless minority, literally spewed out of the mouths of liberty-loving people on account of their servile obedience to a despot and to despotism, they come here and profess a holy horror because the Democrats propose to speak through the responsive and obedient agents of a free and triumphant majority.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if the committee can now extract itself from the wilderness into which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] has led it, I would like to ask—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, just one moment. I understood the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] had already addressed himself to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am proposing to speak on the amendment offered by the last gentleman, and I simply exercise the right that has been exercised by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—which I do not intend to do in this instance—I want to make as rapid progress on this bill as is reasonably possible, and I think gentlemen should confine themselves to one speech on a paragraph. I do not object at this time, because I did not object to my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], but I shall object in the future.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama, rather sympathizing with his purpose, that an objection would not be in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I think an amendment had been made to the third degree, as I understand the parliamentary situation.

Mr. MANN. No; it is not an amendment to the third degree. But I think that it is desirable in the main for gentlemen on both sides of the House, under the circumstances, as a rule, not to expect to talk more than five minutes on a paragraph, unless it is some very substantive amendment. Inasmuch as the gen-

Heaman from Alabama, after making desperate strides up the alleyway, was not able to reach the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] in time and direct him to take his seat, I hope he will not object to the gentleman from Iowa. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that inasmuch as I did not object to the gentleman from Kentucky I shall not object to the gentleman from Iowa in this instance.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume all the five minutes that I could take. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] why it was that these balsams were taken from the free list and placed on the dutiable list?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], if adopted, would be to transfer these balsams from the paragraph where they now carry 10 per cent to the drug paragraph, in another part of the bill, where they would be taxed at the same rate; so that his amendment would have no effect upon the law if it were adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will permit, inasmuch as it is not permissible under the rules of the House to amend a bill in two places, I wish to say that if the amendment is agreed to here and the gentleman offers an amendment under the free list, that carries out the purpose.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Illinois is correct. I could not instruct him. When the gentleman from Illinois makes such a motion he always discloses the fact that he knows what he is doing.

As to placing a 10 per cent tax on these balsams, it is true, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has stated, that they are used in the manufacture of various patent medicines and cough mixtures, but I can not agree with him that this is a grievous hardship upon the poor. If I could, I would stop the circulation among the poor of most of these fake cough medicines, which they themselves are generally ashamed to take in public and squander their money for in private envelopes.

I think it is a very just tax. It is not confiscatory. It is perfectly proper and it is not oppressive, and it is designed to raise about \$15,000 worth of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment, without objection, will be considered withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

11. Barium, chloride of, one-fourth cent per pound; dioxide of, 1 1/2 cents per pound; carbonate of, precipitated, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, line 5, by inserting, after the words "ad valorem," the following: "Provided, That no preparations containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph."

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the amendment.

This is a purely technical amendment, devised to perfect the language of the bill. It is not intended to effect a change in rate. It was adopted by the committee on a suggestion just received from the Treasury Department.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. PAYNE. When the gentleman says it is simply "a technical amendment," I want to ask him if it does not restore the alcohol duty on these articles where alcohol is used in the article?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to my colleague that it was never intended by this committee that the alcohol in any article containing alcohol should be taxed under this paragraph.

Mr. PAYNE. I know that is true, probably.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. We considerably broadened the language of the paragraph in the Payne law, which applies only to blacking or to creams or powders intended for polishing shoes or boots. We have enlarged the language of the law so as to include polishing powders and preparations of all kinds for polishing metals and everything else, and some of these do come in liquid form.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to congratulate my colleagues on the fact that they have made some progress. When they had under

consideration the chemical schedule before, when it came from the Senate it put all alcohol products on the free list, you gentlemen forgetting that there was such a heavy tax upon alcohol. I congratulate them that they have made some little advance, and that at this late moment they have discovered that they ought to make this exception to this paragraph. I am heartily in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get a little information from the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], if I may, in reference to how extensive the change is which is made by this paragraph. The bill of last year provided, and the present law provides, for blacking and polishing for boots and shoes. Now, the gentleman leaves out "for boots and shoes." Of course, this item now covers all blacking or polishing preparations or creams of any kind that are not specially provided for in the section. Of course, I assume that there are an immense quantity and variety of these polishing preparations. Has the gentleman given them very careful attention—

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. In order to be sure that this does not include a lot of things here that he does not wish to include, that are either on the free list now or else ought to pay a higher duty?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that the words "not specially provided for" would cover the situation that he points out. This would not take in the polishing powders for polishing granites, and grit shot, and materials of that kind, because they are specially provided for; but this will include the metal polishes, whereas we originally had proposed to tax only the boot and shoe polishes.

Mr. MANN. Where did they go before?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. They were carried in the basket clause at 25 per cent in the old law, and we have reduced them here to 15 per cent.

Mr. MANN. Of course there are many polishes besides metal polishes and boot and shoe polishes. There are furniture polishes—

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; and glass polishes.

Mr. MANN. A great many different kinds of polishes of all sorts. Now, does this amendment exclude from this all polishes that have alcohol in them?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; so they will fall under the alcohol paragraph of this same schedule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was going to explain, but did not explain, to us about the Treasury Department and the information it brought to the committee in regard to this item. The gentleman said he had information from the Treasury Department about this item, but he did not explain what it was.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that we have just received a criticism from an agent of the Treasury Department to the effect that there might be some confusion in administering the laws if we did not make it perfectly clear in this paragraph that the liquid preparations of blacking containing alcohol were not intended to come in at a rate which is unfair to alcoholic preparations, considering the fact that they have to pay an internal-revenue tax under another feature of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

15. Calomel, corrosive sublimate, and other mercurial medicinal preparations, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, line 13, by striking out the word "medicinal."

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is another committee amendment which is offered merely to perfect the language of the bill, and does not propose to change any rates in the law. The mercurial preparations, other than medicinal, would come in anyway at the same rate of duty under paragraph 5, but by striking out the word "medicinal" here and allowing all mercurial preparations to come in, in the same paragraph as well as at the same rate, it will avoid confusion in the statistical reports to the Treasury Department.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I do.

Mr. MOORE. In paragraph 22 would the gentleman be willing to make the same exception and to insert the words "not medicinal"? Paragraph 22 reads as follows:

22. All other products or preparations of coal tar, not colors or dyes, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Will the gentleman make the same exception there?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the words "not medicinal" in the present law were deliberately stricken out of that paragraph, and the case is not parallel with this.

Mr. MOORE. That would not be excepted?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It would not be excepted, because, in my judgment, there is no analogy between the two.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

21. Coal-tar dyes or colors, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining some information. The present law on this paragraph is 30 per cent ad valorem, the same rate carried in this bill. In the Harrison bill of last year it was proposed to reduce the rate to 25 per cent ad valorem. What is the reason for now increasing that rate?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this is purely a revenue proposition. It is imported already to the extent of about three-quarters of the consumption in this country, and we have to make up somewhere in the tariff for articles that we put on the free list.

Mr. MANN. If this is purely a revenue proposition, when the gentleman was making it up last year in what was much nearer a scientific measure than this, why did he then propose to reduce the rate? What information has the gentleman received since then as to the revenue proposition?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. When we were proposing to reduce the rate from 30 to 25 per cent we were at the same time proposing to tax \$25,000,000 of imports that we have now restored to the free list.

Mr. MANN. That is all very well; but last year when the gentleman brought in his bill he stated the reason for his reduction was that it was a revenue measure. Now he gives the same reason for increasing the rate.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no; I beg the gentleman's pardon. Last year I made the argument for the benefit of the consumer; I did not make the argument that it would increase the revenue by reducing the duty, because it would decrease it.

Mr. MANN. I will do the gentleman from New York the credit to say that I believe he was a real tariff-for-revenue man when he prepared the schedule. Last year he proposed to increase the rate on the raw material and reduce the rate on the finished product, so as to get the largest sum on the raw materials and increase the importation of the finished product. That was a consistent scientific position to take. But now the gentleman is receding from his former position, and gives the same reason for increasing the tax that he gave before for reducing it—in direct opposition.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman is mistaken.

COAL-TAR DYES.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York gave as an excuse a year ago that he considered the bill from a different standpoint, that they were looking for revenue under that bill. Now they have to put back the rate to comply with the present—as my friend used to say—"iniquitous tariff law." I have been glad to notice how much they have found good in the Payne law. Where we increased the rates under that law, time and again they have adopted our increased rates instead of going back to the rates under the Dingley law or putting them below those.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like for the gentleman from New York to point out any single instance in this bill where the Payne bill increased the rate from the Dingley bill and we have kept it.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, on wines and spirits; perhaps the gentleman will recognize that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is that not true of the coal-tar dyes?

Mr. PAYNE. Take jewelry also, another thing. I do not want to yield my time to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was going to help the gentleman out. The statistics in this case sustain the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you. Now, if the gentleman from Alabama understood his bill, he would find a number of instances where we increased the rates and they followed them. I think the gentleman is not quite ingenuous in answering the question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Kansas is wrong.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman from Alabama has heard from the manufacturing interests in this country in reference to coal-tar dyes. He has learned something of their struggles in this business, which have been severe; he has learned that they are now trying to meet the competition of Germany on these colors and dyes, and possibly he looked at the books, as I did, and saw that they were making nothing on their capital. One concern with \$2,000,000 invested, struggling to make cheaper dyes in this country for the manufacturers of cotton and woolen goods was making nothing. Perhaps he has done that and relented a little from his original proposition to tax the manufacturers all along the line, and still when you get to another paragraph with these unpronounceable names, you will find that he has put a tariff duty on the material which these people use in making these coal-tar dyes. I do not know why he did that. It is in the interest of revenue. He said that he is not looking for revenue, and yet in this very schedule we find in note 1, at the bottom of page 84, tucked away in the finest of type, that they have put a duty on \$15,000,000 worth of goods in this very Schedule A that are on the free list in the present tariff law. It looks as though the gentlemen were looking for revenue all along the line in Schedule A, instead of discarding it, and are going back to the rates as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, the same rates that are in the present law, because they did not need the revenue. I can not exactly understand the theory on which this bill is proposed. They say that they are for a competitive tariff, and here is a competition that is wiping out all chance for any profits on the industry, all chance for any increase, and these people are simply subsisting by having a line of trade in other goods that keeps them from the poorhouse, with their \$2,000,000 of invested capital in the city of Buffalo. They do not allow them to have their raw material without paying a tax on it, and putting a tax on the manufacturer, as was said by my colleague from New York countless times during the hearings, saying that that was the Democratic idea, and there was no dissent from any member of the committee during the time of those hearings.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is in error in saying that this committee is following him in the raises that he made from the preceding law. We propose to tax these coal-tar dyes and colors 30 per cent. That is the rate in the existing Payne law and in the Dingley law.

Mr. PAYNE. I have stated that myself.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was lower than that in the Wilson law.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; that is correct. I was about to say that. In the Wilson law it was only 25 per cent ad valorem, but the business of making coal-tar dyes and colors in Germany has largely been created since the days of the Wilson law, and they have to-day substantially displaced most of the natural dyes and colors throughout the world. It is in the hands of an enormous monopoly over there, and I am quite willing to lay this tax on that monopoly. I am not proposing to raise any rates in the law. We are merely adopting the same rates that have been in force that, in view of the fact, seeking for competitive tariffs, we have one here in which about four-fifths of the consumption is imported. My colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has evidently accepted, without investigation, the statements of manufacturers in our country about what does or does not constitute their raw material. I am quite as unable as he is to pronounce the name of the articles to which he refers, but these are not raw materials. He puts them on the free list at the request of a manufacturer in our State, and we propose to put them back again and lay this tax on that manufacturer. They are not raw materials; they are intermediate products. They are semimanufactured, partly finished products, and really all that this manufacturer in Buffalo does with them is to assemble them and then sell them as coal-tar dyes and colors.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] that I examined and found out just what raw material these people did use, and that I cheerfully put it on the free list. They wanted 35 per cent duty, and they demonstrated that in order to meet German competition they needed it. Yet the gentleman says four-fifths of all the product comes in now from Germany. I wanted to put it at 35 per cent, but I was not able to do so, because the manufacturers of cotton and woolen goods did not want the duty put at 35 per cent, just as they do not now, and just as the gentleman is following out their views. I have the right to say that if he says the other of me. They did not want it. They thought they could not get along with the cotton and woolen industry with it. That did not affect me. I was for the 35 per cent, and I am for it to-day if those things have to go back on the dutiable list. I want that industry to thrive. I want

the prices to go down because they do live, because every time these people put one of these coal-tar dyes on the market and get the market in this country the Germans come in here with lower rates and outsell them on that line, and it is only because of the inventive genius of the chemist who is at the head of that Buffalo concern that they have lived a single moment under the rates which they get now.

And the gentleman came along with the announced intention of putting a tax on manufactures, not only a tax upon incomes but a tax upon the materials which they use and have to get and import into this country in order to wreak vengeance on the manufacturer. That seems to be with the majority of this committee a class that should be driven out of existence. Why, they tell you about the immense wealth of the protected manufacturer. I would not invest a dollar in any manufacturing industry in this country under any circumstances. When I was younger I did. My first venture was closed out at 20 cents on the dollar, and I took my 20 cents. I had one dividend in 20 years of 6 per cent, and that was the enormous profit I got.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was that a protected industry?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; it was a protected industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It was the manufacture of agricultural hand tools, and they handed it down to me in that way. I have had other manufacturing investments, very small, and every one of them turned out worse than that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] attempted to justify certain rates that were lower in this bill than those in the bill of last year by saying that new sources of revenue had now been found and that therefore they could reduce the rates from the bill of a year ago. In this particular case they not only have not reduced the duty, but they actually increased the duty 5 per cent. Now, the gentleman suggests one reason for that is that a foreign monopoly controls the product. Now, a monopoly did grow up under the 30 per cent tariff. It has been conclusively proven that we can not maintain the industry in this country with the 30 per cent tariff. Now, does the gentleman take the position that he is willing to further contribute to the foreign monopoly, permit them to charge our American manufacturers what they choose, or that he is in favor of competition by a competitive tariff? Would not he be consistent instead of making a rate of 30 per cent to make it 35 per cent, as the gentleman from New York contends for, so there may be some competition in this country as against that foreign monopoly? If that is not correct, then why does he increase the rate at all? Not for the purpose of revenue, because only half an hour ago he said it was not necessary. These coal-tar dyes are necessities as much as any item in the bill, for every yard of cheap cotton cloth bought in this country must use dyes of this character, and I submit that the committee is entitled to some further explanation from the gentleman from New York. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, to be quite frank, I do not understand upon what side of this question the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin is speaking. He surely did not mean to accuse us of raising any rate. We are not raising rates; we are retaining the same rate as in the present law—

Mr. LENROOT. I mean over the bill of last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Merely to collect revenue on a highly competitive product, and I will say frankly to the gentleman—

Mr. LENROOT. Did not the gentleman say half an hour ago that because of new sources of revenue it was not necessary in this bill to seek for sources of revenue as you did a year ago?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, we have transferred back again to the free list about \$25,000,000 worth of imports that we did propose to tax under last year's bill, and I conceive that the committee has done perfectly right in maintaining such a very highly competitive rate as this and keep the rate at the same figures they are in the present law.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman call a competitive rate a rate upon an article that is practically not produced in this country at all, but is produced wholly abroad?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, it is so highly competitive I should think that if the gentleman were writing this bill from his point of view he would be perfectly consistent in writing in a 35 or 40 per cent rate, because that would still be competitive and would probably afford the American manufacturer sufficient protection, or at least as much as they ask for. The committee conceived it their duty in this particular case to leave it at the point it now is, and—

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman's idea is that there should be competition in this country?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With foreign manufacturers, Mr. LENROOT. With foreign manufacturers and between domestic manufacturers as well, is it not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly; undoubtedly.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, if there be no competition, this being a foreign monopoly, would not the gentleman from his own standpoint be justified in writing the tariff so that it would create competition at home as well as abroad?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That would be a very grave hardship upon the consumer. I think that would be pushing the matter too far.

Mr. LENROOT. Would it be any hardship if a foreign monopoly controls a product, because they can charge what they choose?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that there are foreign monopolies growing up in a great many products which are now imported into the United States, and if we were to fix our tariff rates with sole consideration for that fact we would not ever be able to reduce any of the tariff rates. It is a subject that will undoubtedly occupy the attention of Congress for some years to come, but it can not be, in my judgment, disposed of through the tariff without too great punishment to our own consumers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

22. All other products or preparations of coal tar, not colors or dyes, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman referred a while ago to the gentleman from New York as for tariff for revenue only. I agree to that if it is assumed that there is no difference between a free trader and one who believes in tariff for revenue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has generally appeared to me more nearly as a free trader. He said a moment ago, however, that they had not increased rates generally in the items under discussion. The item now under discussion and some of the items following it, including picric oil, creosote oil, aniline oil, and aniline salts, and coal-tar products with unpronounceable names, and so forth, are all taken from the free list and made dutiable; they are increased in rate. We have had a wonderful object lesson this morning of new Democratic formulas—the formula of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] applying to all the gentlemen on the other side. It is to the effect that if you on that side want to know what your opinion is with regard to any of these items, ask the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has another formula. It is a sort of a dicky's coon-trap formula. It is warranted to "catch 'em comin' and a-goin'." It is a little like the formula of a quack doctor who could not cure anything but fits, and therefore tried to throw his patients into fits when they came to him for treatment.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked the gentleman from New York why he reduced the duty on any one of these articles, he said: "Why, because we have an income tax, and therefore do not need the revenue." We did not have it a year ago; therefore we can make the duty lower than we made it a year ago. And when he asks the gentleman why he takes an article from the free list and places it on the dutiable list, he says that it is because they need the revenue. That is wondrously consistent. The gentleman has been in the minority so long that he does not realize that the time has come now when some of the people in the country will expect him to be consistent. He can not use as an argument that he reduces one rate because he does not need the revenue, and in the same breath, where he increases the rate, that he does it because they do need the revenue. They either do or they do not need the revenue.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is our duty to raise some \$250,000,000 of tariff rates. We have exercised our judgment as best we could, and we have restored to the free list a very large proportion of the taxes we propose to put in upon the schedule revision.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's answer to all of these questions and the excuses he makes for the committee all illustrate this fact: That so far as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] is concerned, it is a matter of utter indifference to him what the effect on the industries of the country will be. There is no suggestion in any of his excuses that protection is not needed or protection is needed. He is perfectly cheerful in reducing the rate on a manufactured or

advanced product and at the same time increasing the rate on every raw material used in advancing or finishing the product.

The gentleman, whatever he may be, is certainly at no point a protectionist. And the only regret he has in regard to this bill is that as we go further along in the bill some other member of the committee will take his place and advance an entirely different formula with regard to other schedules. And we may hear later, not that we do or do not need revenue, but that possibly an industry may need a little protection in order to live. So far as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] is concerned—and I honor him in his honesty of intent and expression—I can not agree with him. As far as the gentleman from New York is concerned, and a large number of gentlemen on the other side, the fact is they have no concern as to the effect of these schedules on the employment or the industries of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

24. Coal-tar products known as anilin oil and salts, toluidine, xyldin, cumidin, binitrotolual, binitrobenzol, benzidin, tolidin, dianisidin, naphthylamin, diphenylamin, benzaldehyde, benzyl chloride, nitro-benzol and nitrotolol, naphthylaminsulfoacids and their sodium or potassium salts, naphtholsulfoacids and their sodium or potassium salts, amido-naphtholsulfoacids and their sodium or potassium salts, amidosalicylic acid, binitrochlorbenzol, diamidostilbendisulfoacid, metanilic acid, paranitranilin, dimethylanilin; all the foregoing not medicinal and not colors or dyes, 10 per cent ad valorem.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, and I do not think there should be a dissenting vote after hearing the paragraph read. [Laughter.]

But there is a better reason for striking out the paragraph than that. I am in favor of giving those people here in this country who have invested their money in an enterprise where they are trying to make coal-tar dyes from these articles to put them on the free list, as they get them free under the present law.

Why, you have demonstrated that you do not need the revenue. You are going to get that out of your income tax. You have demonstrated that you have been trying to throw away revenue, and yet you get back to the chemical schedule you had before the House a year ago. There is no excuse for putting a duty on these articles, except it is to help the German syndicate in securing the balance of the market in this country.

I want to warn the gentlemen on that side that when you have driven these people out of existence here who have been struggling along trying to make these coal-tar dyes and colors, the German syndicate, having their own market, will put their own price upon the articles which are imported here, and they will collect the revenue and our people will have to pay it.

As it is now, they pay the revenue to the United States. But if we can go on and make these articles in this country, and thus take away part of that four-fifths of the monopoly of our market that the German syndicate now has, I think it is worth while. I think it ought to appeal to the good sense of every man on that side, if any there be over there who have not surrendered their conscience and their judgment to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to do their business for them.

Why not quit now, gentlemen, and let the gentleman from Alabama report this bill at once, unless you are going to represent something here besides the German syndicate that has got control of this whole business? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman, there has been so much said about this German syndicate and this coal-tar schedule that I want to say a few words to set the matter right.

Every product in this whole paragraph is made by some German syndicate. They would rather sell these products than the finished products, because these products are controlled by syndicates abroad, while most of the colors are not.

We have been taxing every manufacturer of cottons and woollens, every cotton and woolen mill, every ink man, and every paint man on aniline colors 30 per cent, to prove that we can not make those articles in this country. There is one plant in Albany, N. Y., one in Buffalo, and two in Newark, N. J., and I own one of them. We can not make these colors and never will.

There is no German syndicate, so called. There are several combinations of German manufacturers. One of them is composed of three manufacturers. And then there is a combination, not as direct as the first, of three manufacturers on certain interests and almost entirely on scientific lines. There is competition among every one of them. Every one of them has a branch or agent in this country, and they all compete, hammer and tongs, tooth and nail. The prices are the same throughout the world. Each factory sells its own product to every country

in the world at the same figure. Our mills are in competition with certain people in England, who buy at a certain price less our duty. They have branches in this country engaged in manufacturing. They have accounts with the German manufacturer, and they get the same discount on the goods they buy for the branch in this country that they do in England.

In this country we have been taxing the manufacturer of woollens and the manufacturer of cottons on these articles for 30 years past.

All these products are bought from the German syndicate. These intermediate products—not the raw material—are highly developed compounds. They are controlled abroad by syndicates, and all the syndicate has got to do is simply refuse to sell to the American manufacturer and he is out of business. When this proposition was offered in the Payne-Aldrich bill, I opposed it. I was not on the floor, but came down here and opposed it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The proposition to put them on the free list.

Mr. METZ. To put them on the free list. There is no sense in it. There has not been one single additional aniline color made here, and I will tell you why, because some of the factories here had to agree to make no new colors in order to get the stuff at all from the other side.

Let us get away from this trust business on colors on the other side. There is no such thing, and the American manufacturer of cottons and woollens has got to pay 30 per cent more for every pound of dyestuff he uses in the cheapest cloths than the manufacturer in Germany and other European countries has to pay. That is the real situation.

Mr. SWITZER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he had to account for this product sent over here by the German syndicate?

Mr. METZ. No; I said this: Take the English manufacturer. I have one in mind now who says he is going to close up. He has a branch here. He buys in England and he buys here. He gets from the German manufacturer a discount at the end of the year for all the color he buys, and he includes in that discount what he buys for his American branch.

Mr. SWITZER. Do you have to account for the goods?

Mr. METZ. No; I do not account. He reports what he buys here.

Mr. SWITZER. Are you an agent?

Mr. METZ. I am not an agent. I buy and sell on my own account and get all I can get out of it. That is my business.

Mr. SWITZER. You have to account for the goods?

Mr. METZ. I do not have to account at all. He accounts to the people abroad, and that is the way they control it over there; but there is active competition between the various color manufacturers.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's contention is that this paragraph contained in this bill will be a help to the maker of fabrics.

Mr. METZ. No; it will not help him. The manufacturers of fabrics do not use these raw materials. The only men who use them are the few aniline color makers in this country, of whom I am one.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understood the gentleman to say it would be a benefit to the manufacturer of fabrics.

Mr. METZ. He has to pay 30 per cent on the finished colors when he buys his colors, and we charge a profit on the duty and the colors. I am simply stating the facts. I am not talking on the merits of it at all.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to strike out the last word. I am glad to find out who is responsible for this business. I remember my colleague here appearing four years ago in the guise of a manufacturer of these colors and dyes.

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. He says he is discouraged. I should think he would be. He well may be. I only wish he had the splendid courage of Mr. Schoellkopf, of Buffalo, who has not only put his fortune but his life work into the development of this industry. He is a chemist who has no superior in Germany or the United States.

Mr. METZ. He would not believe that himself.

Mr. PAYNE. He is a man who understands his business, and who is still hopeful, still struggling, and will continue to struggle as will many an American manufacturer under the iniquities of this proposed bill.

Why, some one said the other day that there would be no stopping of industries unless it was done for effect.

How little such a man understands the courage of the average American. They will not stop until they are forced to stop. This gentleman gives up now and throws up his hands, and, as I understand him, is a customer of this German syndicate.

Mr. METZ. So is Mr. Schoellkopf.

Mr. PAYNE. In these articles with unpronounceable names; yes. My colleague speaks in one breath of the German syndicate and in another he says there is no German syndicate. I do not know what he means. His colleague on the Ways and Means Committee says there is a German syndicate, and that is the universal information that comes to us. Why help the German syndicate? Do you help the American manufacturer of cotton goods in keeping the same duty of 30 per cent on these colors and dyes? It is not these unpronounceable things that the manufacturer of cheap cloth goods uses in this country; it is the finished color and dyes. What possible excuse is there for putting this duty on these unpronounceable things except to cripple the American manufacturer of colors and dyes, destroying his industry, for the men can not live altogether on courage—which my colleague seems to lack—not altogether on courage, but he must get something back in order to live. Why destroy this industry to help no one except to get a few paltry dollars of revenue on these unpronounceable things? Why destroy an industry in the interest of the German syndicate? If they do not get the unpronounceable things they can not go on with the industry; they can not make the color and dyes. Why, the committee could not have planned better to destroy this great industry of the men of brawn and brains in the city of Buffalo if they had gone deliberately about it; but yielding to the importunities of my friend from New York who deals with the German syndicate in these unpronounceable things they have yielded.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to set the gentleman from New York right and I want to set myself right.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will set himself right first.

Mr. METZ. That is what I will do. I know this business and the gentleman does not, with all due apology to the gentleman from New York. These things that he speaks of with the unpronounceable names I can pronounce myself.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; and I can if I work hard.

Mr. METZ. I know the gentleman can. He has been up against them a good many times, especially in connection with Mr. Schoellkopf. I sell him some of these things myself. All these things are controlled by the syndicates and the finished colors are not—only to a small extent. There is competition, and that is the difference. Now, I have not advocated putting these things on the dutiable list. I am a member of the Democratic Party, and I am with my party on this thing.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course the gentleman is.

Mr. METZ. And so is the gentleman from New York with his party.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. The rules provide that there shall be five minutes' debate on either side of an amendment, and I make the point of order that debate is exhausted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask as between the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, if we have not a demonstration here that you can not revise the tariff intelligently without a scientific report?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that the debate on the amendment proposed is exhausted.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURDOCK. But, Mr. Chairman, I have offered another amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. I raise the point of order that there are already two amendments pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, offered an amendment to strike out the paragraph, and on that was heard for five minutes. The gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, was heard in reply for five minutes. Thereupon the gentleman from New York rose and moved to strike out the last word. The point of order was not made, and the gentleman from New York being a member of the committee, the Chair did not feel called upon to offer a suggestion, and the gentleman from New York proceeded.

Mr. MANN. And I submit that it was not subject to a point of order; where a motion is made to strike out a paragraph, it is in order to perfect the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Alabama said that he intended to enforce the rule under the five-minute debate, and he shut off a man from the floor who had rights. Here is the situation: The gentleman from New York, as the Chair has said, offered an amendment striking out the paragraph. Debate on that amendment is exhausted, but as an amendment to that,

quite within the rule, a motion to strike out the last word was proposed, and debate on that was exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to correct him? Debate on that was not exhausted. The gentleman from New York addressed himself to his amendment to strike out the last word, and it was during his address that he was questioned by his colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, was through and that then the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, took the floor. Then the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, again spoke, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, interrupted him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the time of the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, on his last amendment was not exhausted. He apparently had concluded, and turned to take his seat, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, rose and asked him if he would yield, and he did yield, and then the debate occurred.

Mr. GARDNER. The Chair would not hold that if the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, had abandoned the floor that that was not the equivalent of his five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, really had not taken his seat.

Mr. PAYNE. I was asked a question, but I yield the floor now.

The CHAIRMAN. He was turning to take his seat.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, another parliamentary inquiry: Is the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] to strike out the last two words in order except as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks, however, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is entitled to recognition for five minutes in opposition to the last amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. GARDNER. Provided the time was not exhausted by the gentleman from New York, Mr. METZ, who had the floor, apparently, in his own right, because he did not await recognition either of the Chair or of the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold, in connection with that, that that was in the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. GARDNER. The Chair will permit me to say that I was particularly watching, noticing that the debate was being carried on so that the Members of the House could not hear, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was out of the room. I was particularly watching, and saw the occurrence, as I believe, exactly as I stated it to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, may be in error.

Mr. GARDNER. I wish to point out that the rules were being neglected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be withdrawn and the question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York to strike out the last word.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

26. Collodion and all other liquid solutions of pyroxylin, or of other cellulose esters, or of cellulose; compounds of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, whether known as celluloid or by any other name, if in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, or other forms not polished, wholly or partly, and not made into finished or partly finished articles, 15 per cent ad valorem; if polished, wholly or partly, or if finished or partly finished articles, of which collodion or any compound of pyroxylin or other cellulose esters, by whatever name known, is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Collodion and all other liquid solutions of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters or of cellulose, 15 per cent ad valorem; compounds of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, whether known as celluloid, pyralin, fiberloid, viscoloid, or by any other name, if in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, or other forms, not polished, wholly or partly, and not made up into finished or partly finished articles, 35 per cent ad valorem.

rem; if polished, wholly or partly or if finished or partly finished articles, of which collodion or any compound of pyroxylin or other cellulose esters by whatever name known, is the component material of chief value, 45 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article of which a compound of pyroxylin, or of other cellulose esters, is a component of chief value, shall be entered for import under any other classification bearing a lower rate of duty.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, the material with which this paragraph deals and to which my amendment in the way of a substitute refers is what is commonly known as celluloid, and my amendment is to increase the duties on the ordinary sheets to 35 per cent and on the finished product to 45 per cent. Now, this is a comparatively new substance in the industrial world. It was invented by Americans, it is an original American product, but Germany and France have equipped themselves and can make this substance cheaper than we can, and for two reasons: First, because of the ordinary reason of cheaper labor cost there, and, second, for the additional reason that all these materials from which this product is made are cheaper there than they are here. The tissue paper, for instance, which is one of the main ingredients, is cheaper by 3 cents per pound. Camphor is one of the most expensive articles used in the manufacture.

Now, all our camphor comes practically from Japan, and in Germany it is all admitted free, while in the United States it is taxed; and this very bill, while reducing the tax on celluloid, increases the tax on camphor, one of its essential ingredients. It reduces the tax on the finished product but increases the tax on the raw material.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman puts the duty at 35 per cent—I am not supposing what the law is on camphor—and then puts the duty of 35 per cent on the finished product of celluloid, is not the celluloid manufacturer on the whole amply compensated for the 35 per cent he pays on his camphor?

Mr. GILLET. That is not the fact. If the gentleman will listen, I think I can show him. That is not the fact, because the duty on camphor is increased. The camphor in a pound of celluloid costs 2 cents more here than in Germany. Alcohol is also a necessary ingredient. That is 1 cent a pound more expensive here than in Germany, and then the oils and acids are each 1 cent a pound cheaper there, so that the German cost of materials is about 8½ cents per pound less than our cost of materials, which makes, reduced to percentage, a difference in favor of Germany of about 20 per cent.

Now, as I understand, the Committee on Ways and Means thinks the cost of materials is only about 15 per cent higher here than in Europe. I think they are mistaken in that, but it is only a difference of opinion, and the difference is not great. But the fundamental and fatal danger to this American industry is that the basis on which the Committee on Ways and Means have fixed this 15 per cent ad valorem, which they have given, is that that exactly equalizes, in their opinion, the difference in the cost of the ingredients which go into the manufacture in Europe and here, and leaves the German manufacturer and the American manufacturer on exactly an equal level, taking no account of the different cost of labor here and there. The advantage is, of course, all with the German. But that, I understand, is the theory upon which they have fixed the percentage of 15 per cent ad valorem, because that exactly compensates for the different cost of materials. Now, that leaves absolutely no allowance in the difference of the cost of labor in Germany and France and the United States, and therefore in my amendment I provide a greater duty, 35 per cent, not enough I fear, but enough to somewhat equalize the labor cost between Europe and the United States. That is the Republican system.

And I might also mention that there has recently been started in Japan, where all the camphor comes from, by one of the wealthy families of that country which controls all the output of its camphor, a \$1,000,000 plant, equipped with American machinery, ready to manufacture for the world's markets, with the cheap Japanese labor and with the world's supply of camphor under its control.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] accepts the rates we have proposed in this bill upon collodion, which we have reduced from 70 to 15 per cent, but he proposes to raise the duty upon the manufactures of collodion which are generally known as celluloid. The gentleman from Massachusetts has given us a statement which, no doubt, has been furnished to him by reliable people as to the difference in cost of manufacturing celluloid articles here and abroad, and I want to point out that he gives a perfect illustration of the impossibility of fixing tariff rates upon investigations into the cost of

production. He says, for example, that the additional cost of the paper out of which the celluloid is made is 5 cents a pound to the disadvantage of the American manufacturer.

Mr. GILLET. Three cents a pound in the material. The amount the paper pays is 5 cents, but 3 cents a pound on the celluloid.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is exactly the statement furnished to me, namely, that it was 3 cents a pound. I received from a manufacturer recently a statement as to costs, which somewhat parallel those which the gentleman from Massachusetts has advanced here. But I wish to point out that these arguments as to the cost are largely theoretical. Now, in the first place, as to paper. The way they make celluloid is to dip the tissue paper in a bath of mixed acids and with a solution of camphor they make the celluloid. The manufacturers here make their own paper. The tariff of 30 per cent on paper probably has nothing to do with their own factory cost. It is also true that they refine their own camphor. They import crude camphor from Japan. The rates of duty on refined camphor are not of so much importance to them. Now, the acids that they use—nitric and sulphuric acid—are on the free list, so that the only item on this bill in which the tariff adversely affects the manufacturers of celluloid in the United States is this 1 cent per pound we propose on crude camphor. If they choose to import refined camphor instead of crude, we have reduced the duty on that from 6 to 5 cents a pound in this bill. I think the 15 per cent ad valorem proposed upon celluloid in blocks, sheets, and rods represents fairly the rate under which there will be competition. There are several million dollars' worth made in our country, and look at the importation for last year. There were \$2,600 worth of importation. The probability is that the present specific duty on these articles is so prohibitive that it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 100 per cent instead of 20 per cent, as it appears in the Treasury reports, and I feel that they have taken full advantage of the manufactured duty in the prices which they charge the American consumers. What do they do with the celluloid? They make it up themselves into boxes, brushes, and combs, so that the duty on celluloid in sheets is of very little importance to the American manufacturer. What they sell to the public is the finished product of the celluloid, and on this our duty is 35 per cent. I think this is a very fair and competitive tariff on the three grades of articles carried in the paragraph.

Mr. GILLET. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact, as you say, that little of it is incorporated as appears in the reports, that there is a great deal of celluloid imported that does not appear in the customhouse reports as celluloid, because it comes in as other articles?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It does; and that is a cause of a great deal of complaint, because articles like brushes and combs, which were intended to carry a small duty, and American manufacturers have endeavored sometimes to have them carried under this celluloid paragraph, which bears a very high duty. That is one of the questions which I think is cleared up under this bill. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

27. Coloring for brandy, wine, beer, or other liquors, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARDNER. I hold in my hand a letter dated at Washington, D. C., April 10, 1913, addressed to some finishers of textile fabrics in my State:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 10, 1913.

MY DEAR SIR: In the caucus yesterday, when Schedule A was under discussion, I offered an amendment placing indigo on the free list instead of at 10 per cent ad valorem. I picked indigo out because it was the most logical item on which to appeal to the caucus, as it affected the cotton mills of the South, and because it had been struck from the late Underwood bill by the Senate Finance Committee and recommended to be put on the free list in both the majority and the minority reports. The result was a vote of 54 in favor and 112 against. This showed that the Ways and Means Committee has the caucus under working control.

I was informed by many Members, some of them I had not known before, that they were impressed by my argument, and that, as they put it, "I had put it all over" the committee. I feel that I have gained at least the attention of the Members and that they think that I at least know what I am talking about.

With this advantage in view I am going to offer an amendment to Schedule K to insert, after section 322, page 77, the words—
"The rates provided in this schedule shall take effect on the first day of the sixth month following the passage of this act."

And in the free list, after sections 764 and 655, page 129, to insert the words—
"To take effect first day of the third month after the passage of this act."

I will explain to the caucus the reason for these amendments and what will be the effect of the bill as it now stands if it goes into effect immediately upon passage.

I am promised the support of many Members for the first proposition, but of not so many for the last one. However, if I get the first the last will not be so important. It may help with the wool men.

I am afraid, however, that not a single amendment to the committee bill as reported will be made by the caucus, and the only hope of change of any kind lies in the Senate. It appears to have become an administration measure, pure and simple, and many of the schedules have been rewritten within the last 10 days, as far as I can see, at the suggestion of the President and on the basis of passing a competitive and revenue tariff only.

Yours, truly,

H. A. METZ.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Is he our Member here?

Mr. GARDNER. The writer is a Democratic Member of this House. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. METZ. Mr. Chairman, I plead guilty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I wrote that to some of the mills in the East with which I have been in business relations for many years, who made suggestions to me to put before the caucus. That was my duty, which I, as a manufacturer of woollens myself, owed them.

I said before that I did not approve of some of these rates. I made my fight in the caucus and was beaten, and I am willing to stand by my caucus bill and by my House bill as it is approved by my party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I realize that some of these things might be changed and I said so in the caucus. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I know as a manufacturer that they might be improved. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.] But I want to say that they are just as good as some of the things in the old Payne-Aldrich bill for the manufacturer. I do not, as a manufacturer, want protection. What I want is the same chance that I get in Europe, and therefore I suggested that indigo be made free because it is free in Europe. I suggested that it be made free, not only for the benefit of the South, which makes these cheap kinds of goods, but for the benefit of the mills of the rest of the country also.

I would like also to have the free list extended by the addition of alizarine and aniline colors. The committee said they were put on the dutiable list for revenue purposes. They are noncompetitive articles. We must import them. In the judgment of the caucus they are revenue producers, and I shall vote for them as revenue producers. I will, however, continue my efforts to change them along the same line while the bill is before the Senate. I do not apologize for that letter. I think it is the duty of every Congressman from every State to vote as he thinks in the caucus and to stand for what he thinks will help, as to anything he knows about, rather than to do it in a perfunctory way where it does no good. I plead guilty to the writing of that letter, and I am glad I wrote it. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I notice you said in this letter that the vote upon this particular motion that you made in the caucus was 112 for and 54 against.

Mr. METZ. No; the other way.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. One hundred and twelve against.

Mr. METZ. I think it was 102. I do not remember the exact figures, whatever they were.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I was going to ask you how that vote of 112 to maintain this item in the bill in a House of 433 Members compared with the average vote on these different items?

Mr. METZ. Do you mean as a caucus vote?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. METZ. I guess it was as good a vote as was ever had in any Republican caucus.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does it compare favorably with the other votes on the various items?

Mr. METZ. I think it was somewhat larger than most of them.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Most of them were smaller?

Mr. METZ. This was a little larger, I think.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman would confer a great favor upon us all if he would tell us how, after the caucus had voted down his amendment by a vote of 2 to 1, he managed to slip it into the bill before the bill was introduced into the House.

Mr. METZ. I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that I did not slip anything into the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is in the bill as reported.

Mr. METZ. I was very much gratified, and so were the manufacturers, when my colleague from New York [Mr. HARRISON] told me the committee had reconsidered and had decided to put indigo on the free list, where it always had been, for the benefit of men who make cheap cotton goods, among the most important of which are the overalls worn by laboring men. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These cheap cotton goods include goods which are made in this country for export—cheap calicoes, cotton prints, and cheap cotton goods of various kinds—as against the manufactures in England.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. METZ. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that after the Democratic caucus had voted down the amendment proposed by the gentleman to place indigo upon the free list, notwithstanding the vote in the caucus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], a colleague of my distinguished friend now on the floor, had the authority to change it entirely?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no.

Mr. METZ. I do not think so.

Mr. MANN. He did it.

Mr. METZ. No; I believe that my argument was so good that the Ways and Means Committee were convinced I was right and saw the justice of it and put it on the free list; that is all. Have you got any more letters? [Laughter and applause.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

28. Drugs, such as barks, beans, berries, buds, bulbs, bulbous roots, excrescences, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, dried insects, grains, gums, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, roots, stems, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), seeds of morbid growth, and weeds; any of the foregoing which are natural and uncomounded drugs and not edible, and not specially provided for in this section, but which are advanced in value or condition by shredding, grinding, chipping, crushing, or any other process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the drugs and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I personally feel very much obliged to the gentleman from New York for accepting as true the statements which I made last year, which he then contradicted, concerning the effect of inserting in this paragraph the word "peeling." In the bill last year he put a tax on barks, and so forth, which had been advanced by peeling. The gentleman and I had quite a controversy as to what that meant. The gentleman insisted then that he was right. I thank him now for admitting that I was then right, by leaving out the word "peeling," proposed in the paragraph of last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. MANN. I have only five minutes. In this paragraph last year were nutgalls. Nutgalls are now on the free list. In the bill of last year it was proposed to put them on the dutiable list. The bill restored nutgalls to the free list. Nutgalls are used for the manufacture of gallic acid. Gallic acid is used in the manufacture of pyrogallol acid. The gentleman last year proposed to put a tariff on the raw material and reduce the tariff on the finished product, and defended it as a revenue proposition. Now, in this bill he proposes to restore the raw material to the free list and increase the tariff on the finished product, directly the reverse in both cases of what he did last year. He then said he wanted to put a tariff on the raw material to raise revenue. Now, he abandons the idea of a tax on the raw material and puts an increased tariff on the finished product.

The gentleman will have great difficulty in explaining why he has made the changes he made in this bill from the one of last year. Then he said he could tax the raw material and reduce the tax on the finished product. Now he says that he comes to the position which I urged last year in an amendment which I offered, which, on the gentleman's advice, was rejected, that we ought to give the manufacturer the raw material free and a reasonable tariff on the manufactured product. That is what this bill does. So that after all, even without a tariff commission, a mere debate in the House adds something, possibly, to the sum of knowledge possessed by so distinguished a gentleman as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. If we had a tariff commission which would report the facts in regard to cases like this, there would not be the mistake in the

bill passed last year by the House and which, if the gentleman had had the power, would have been sent to the President, which has been retracted this year as to both lines of argument.

Mr. COOPER and Mr. HARRISON of New York rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will take only a minute, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit me. I have already answered these arguments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who seems to assume that he has written this schedule. I am very glad to have him get some of the glory of it, but I am sure he will not assume any of the responsibility. Gallnuts were put back on the free list because since the proposed revision of last year we have put all leathers on the free list, and gallnuts are used not only in making gallic acid but in making tannic acid, and tannic acid is used to some extent in tanning leathers. That is the reason for that change and not the additional information which the gentleman from Illinois seems to think has burst upon us as the result of his speeches.

Mr. MANN. Having put nutgalls on the free list, for any reason, then why does the gentleman increase the rate on the finished product?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the Payne law puts the same tax on gallic acid and pyrogallac acid, the one being made from the other, and we have merely corrected that illogical situation.

Mr. MANN. Not at all. The gentleman is mistaken as to his facts.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. I assert that the gentleman is mistaken as to his facts.

Mr. COOPER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak upon this paragraph, but changed my intention after hearing what was said a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He ridiculed the idea that any possible good could come out of a tariff commission and declared, in effect, that anybody who says that such a body will be a nonpartisan commission talks nonsense. I happened to remember what the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said about the tariff board in debate here when he was discussing the chemical bill last year and of the great assistance the board's report had been to him and to the other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee in the preparation of the chemical schedule which they then submitted, and so I went to the library and procured the volume of the Record which I have in my hand.

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, before I read what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said at that time, I will digress long enough to remind the House that in 1911, two years ago, the Committee on Ways and Means reported a bill to completely revise the chemical schedule, and that every rate in that bill was an ad valorem rate. Members on the other side voted for it unanimously, and it passed the House; but last year, only one year later, they reported another chemical schedule, with entirely different rates, abandoned the ad valorem rates, and made every rate specific that could in any way be made so. And why? Hear the gentleman tell why. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in supporting that bill, in February, 1912, said:

But, more than this, and in addition, the Democratic membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this bill has had the benefit of the report of the Tariff Board on Schedule A. [Applause.]

The report of the Tariff Board consists of a glossary of the paragraphs of the existing law and, in addition, an economic review of the chemical industry in the United States, in Canada, in France, in England, and in Germany. The members of the Ways and Means Committee take this opportunity of expressing to the Tariff Board their appreciation of the very valuable assistance which this report has been to them in the preparation of their bill.

That was a direct declaration by the distinguished gentleman from New York that the board's report was of great value, and the members of the board were competent, industrious, and honest. What becomes, then, of the statement of the gentleman from Texas about the uselessness of such a board? It was sarcastic and not a little harsh, if we think of the men who composed the board, but it met with applause upon the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DIES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I can not yield, I have only a moment or two longer. I wish to add this only. The Tariff Board did not

report, did not have the time to report, upon the difference in the cost of producing chemicals and their compounds in foreign competing countries and in this country. It is true that the board had not had sufficient time to investigate and to submit a report upon that point, touching the chemical schedule, although they had so reported upon the cotton schedule and the woolen schedule. If the members of the board were honest, competent, and industrious in reporting on this chemical schedule, in so far as they had time to go, so competent, industrious, and honest that their work was of great value to the gentleman from New York and to his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, what right has he or any other man now to say that if they had had an opportunity to go further the board would not have been equally honest, competent, and industrious in reporting upon the difference in the cost of production in this and in competing countries? In other words, why should not this House have what Germany has, what France has, a report of impartial experts, presenting all the facts which we, as legislators, ought to possess in order to legislate wisely upon a subject of such an exceedingly important character? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee in discussing something that is not pertinent to this paragraph, but I have heard gentlemen on that side of the House continually refer to the necessity of a tariff board, ignoring the fact that this House has equipped a bureau of the Government to do this work. Of course, I recognize there are some gentlemen on that side of the House who desire a tariff board or tariff commission, which shall be empowered with the duty and the power to take away from this House, the representatives of the people, the right to tax the American people.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield.

Mr. COOPER. I deny there is any such man in the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not talking about the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman sometimes thinks he is the whole show, when he is a very small part of that side of the House. I am talking about that side of the House. There are those on that side of the House, on both sides of the minority, who would surrender the rights of the American people to legislate through their Representatives.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I can not yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to deny that for the Progressives.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I recognize there are others, and I think these others constitute a majority of the Members on that side of the House, and a large majority, who merely desire a tariff board for the purpose of gathering information. Now, I most heartily concur with those gentlemen who desire to have the committees of this House informed on this great question from other sources than the interested sources from which that side of the House for many years obtained its information, to wit, the parties who benefited by the protective-tariff duties.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I asked not to be interrupted; I have only five minutes. Now, I want to say to that side of the House and gentlemen on this side of the House who are not informed as to the legislation of the past that although this side of the House declined absolutely to continue the Tariff Board—that cost the American people a half a million dollars for three years in doing the work that was only partially executed and that would have taken 10 or 12 years to revise a whole tariff bill—this side of the House wrote into one of the great appropriation bills the organization of a Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce, giving it full authority, more authority than you gave your so-called Tariff Board, more authority than you proposed in the bills you have introduced to create a tariff commission, to investigate the facts in reference to all matters that concern the making of a tariff bill and to report those facts both to the President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, the board that you created was to report to the President and the report had to filter out to the people's Representatives through the Executive of the Nation. The bureau we have created with the power to investigate these tariff questions is authorized and directed to report directly to the Congress of the United States. Now, that bureau is not vitalized; and why? We put the law on the statute books; it is there; but after it was enacted into law your party, being in power, authorized to make the estimates for the Government, failed or refused to make the estimates to fully vitalize that bureau.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen on that side of the House that you need not worry about this question. The Democratic administration and the Democratic House in the near future is going to vitalize that bureau by the necessary appropriations and extend its powers to get information that will be of use to the committees whether they are Republicans or Democrats in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, after line 21, add a new paragraph, as follows: 28½. Coperas, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to assume that there is something in the argument of the eloquent gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] with regard to the farmer's boy, and that having been born somewhere in Kentucky, and having first seen the light of day under his father's humble roof, he was urged by the folks to better his condition and get out of the slough of the farm and go to the city; that having done so he studied the art of chemistry, and, having perfected himself, he made certain discoveries which were of value to his countrymen; that having thus put himself in a position to compete with men of talent and ability he organized a business and started a factory for the manufacture of coperas; that having done this and brought into employment men to whom he paid on an average \$11.50 a week he found that he was compelled to compete with men engaged in the same business, men of the same cleverness and of the same ingenuity, in Italy and Spain and in England, and that he found that in England they paid a weekly wage of \$4.87 against the \$11.50 he had paid for American labor; that he also had to compete against labor in Italy at 75 cents a day and labor in Spain at 55 cents a day. Then I want also to draw the attention of the folks back home to this boy who, by borrowing money and inducing friends to have confidence in him in the great city, had made an investment of \$250,000 in the plant. I want them to know that his success was due to protection which had been assured him by the laws of the United States against the cheap material that was coming in over the borders from 55 and 75 cents a day labor, which protection is now about to be removed by a bill known as the Underwood bill.

I want the folks back home, who still have some pride in the boy whom they sent to the city, to know what the country boy who came to the city is up against through the measure now advanced by his alleged friends of the Democratic Party. I am making this argument for the benefit of the folks back home, and in order that you may pass the amendment I have offered restoring the protective rate on an American industry which protects the country boy in the city who suddenly finds himself cast down by those who happen to be in political control. Vote for the farmer's boy and let this amendment go through.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in what my farmer friend from Pennsylvania is saying—

Mr. MOORE. I was born on a farm.

Mr. ADAMSON. He looks it.

Mr. DIES. I am interested—

Mr. HOWARD. Sit down.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I heard from a Member rising on the other side of the House a moment ago the admonition "Sit down." I want to ask whether it is in the rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman it is not within the rules, but the gentleman is out of order inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has the floor.

Mr. MOORE. Is it in order for the Chair to call a gentleman down when he is out of order, or is it in order for a Member to say, "Sit down"?

The CHAIRMAN. It is certainly in order for the Chair to call the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order if he is out of order.

Mr. MOORE. "The gentleman from Pennsylvania" submits to the Chair.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

29. Ergot, 10 cents per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard from the leading counsel for the defense as to his objection to a tariff board. We have heard what he has to say against the Republican Party because it favored a tariff board.

Why, gentlemen, exactly the same bill that we are going to offer in our motion to recommit was before this House on January 30, 1911, and in casting my eye down the column to see who voted in favor of that tariff board I find the name of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat amused by the belated activities of our Republican and other friends for a tariff board. It is true that during the dying hours of the Sixty-first Congress, just before the Democratic Party came into power in the House, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and his colleagues made a pretense of attempting to establish a tariff board. [Applause.] They had permitted the entire session to go by, and in its dying hours pretended that the wicked Democrats, of whom I was one of the most conspicuous, had prevented the most autocratic machine ever known in this House from passing the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But their belated efforts are amusing to those who are familiar with legislation and with the facts. In 1888 Congress conferred this power upon the Bureau of Labor by this provision:

The Commissioner of Labor, in accordance with the general design and duties referred to in section 1 of this act, is especially charged to ascertain at as early a date as possible, and whenever industrial changes shall make it essential, the cost of producing articles at the time dutiable in the United States, in leading countries where such articles are produced, by fully specified units of production, and under a classification showing the different elements of cost, or approximate cost, of such articles of production, including the wages paid in such industries per day, week, month, or year, or by the piece; and hours employed per day; and the profits of the manufacturers and producers of such articles; and the comparative cost of living, and the kind of living. * * * What articles are controlled by trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor, and what effect said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have on production and prices. He shall also establish a system of reports by which, at intervals of not less than two years, he can report the general condition, so far as production is concerned, of the leading industries of the country.

That statute was passed, as I have said, in 1888; and yet the Republican Party revised the tariff three times after it was enacted, and never suggested that a single dollar be appropriated to enable the Republican Commissioner of Labor to ascertain the facts authorized to be ascertained under that statute.

But after the country had repudiated the Republican Party for the indefensible pretense of a revision of the tariff downward, contained in the Payne-Aldrich bill, in order, as President Taft said in his famous Winona speech, to tide over the four years of the period intervening before a presidential election, so that the Republicans could have a chance to get together, they suggested in the dying hours of the Sixty-first Congress that a tariff board or commission be created, so as to prevent the Democratic Party carrying out the mandate of the country. In the Sixty-second Congress the Democratic House enacted a very beneficial piece of constructive legislation. It consolidated in the Department of Commerce and Labor certain functions that had theretofore been assigned to certain bureaus in the Department of State, together with these functions in the Bureau of Labor. That law was approved in August, 1912. The Republicans had been pretending that they wished information obtained in a certain manner, and yet the Republican administration submitted no estimate to carry out the enlarged functions of the newly established Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce until January, 1913. Two days after the legislative bill had been reported to the Senate of the United States, after having passed the House, the Republican administration transmitted a communication to Congress requesting an appropriation of \$20,000 to enable it to obtain the desired information. In explanation of the transmission of the estimate otherwise than in the regular Book of Estimates, as required by the statute—and this act having been enacted in August there was ample time to transmit it in the regular way—they stated that it was impossible for the department to submit to Congress an estimate of this work—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. With the permission of the House, I will extend this in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. MANN. I shall object to extensions of remarks when the requests are made from the floor in this way, as gentlemen already have the authority.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not catch the gentleman's remark.

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen already have general authority to print—which I regret.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For the information of gentlemen on that side I wish to state that I will print this in the RECORD.

Secretary Nagel in his letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, which was transmitted by the latter to the President of the Senate on January 11, 1913, made the following statement:

It was impossible for the department to submit to Congress an estimate for this work before this time, owing to the fact that the extent of the requests for information along the lines covered by the law, which necessarily would control the extent of the investigations to be made by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, could not be determined subsequent to the time the law imposing these new duties upon that bureau was passed by Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that the Democratic Party had created a great new bureau of the Government to obtain information such as we desired to have obtained by a tariff commission. I suppose it is not strange that the gentleman from Alabama has fallen into that error, because with his multitudinous duties in regard to the tariff he does not keep very close track of the appropriation bills.

What you did do was to cut out three bureaus of the Government and put only one in its place, and then not make a sufficient appropriation for the maintenance of the one. There was the Bureau of Manufactures, the Bureau of Statistics, and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the State Department, the first two being in the Department of Commerce and Labor. You abolished these bureaus as a matter of economy, and it was so stated on the floor to the House, and you created only one bureau to take the place of the three and then refused to make a sufficient appropriation for the one.

I am surprised, in a way, at what has just been said here. I suppose there is no one in the House except the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who just addressed it, who would have the gall to lay upon a Republican administration the failure to make the appropriation he suggested. The Taft administration sent an estimate to the House asking for an appropriation to continue the Tariff Board. That was the proposition we desired to have enacted into law. You refused to give the appropriation to continue the Tariff Board, and at the same time, with all your ingenuity, did not propose to increase the appropriation for the new bureau. You were not frank then and you are not frank now about it. We were asking for an appropriation of sufficient amount to do the work which was desired to be done. If you preferred to have that work done by the bureau in the Department of Commerce, why did you not make the appropriation for that bureau instead of for the Tariff Board, for which the President had asked it? You have always resisted the increased appropriations for the Department of Commerce and Labor, and they never had the authority to make the investigation which we on this side of the House desired to have made. I do not know whether you are in the end going to do what the gentleman from Alabama says—largely increase the appropriation for this bureau. I have consistently fought for many years to secure an increase of the appropriations for these bureaus, for one of which I wrote the law creating the Department of Commerce and Labor.

You abolish that bureau. You have put nothing in its place which properly answers for the work it was designed for. If you increase your appropriation, very well. What the country wants is a tariff commission in which it will have confidence, and which when it reports as to the facts those facts will be taken as true by the country and by the Members of Congress who pass tariff laws. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the inconsistency and insincerity of the Republican Party, when it wants to play politics, is wonderful to behold. Many of you will recall that during the final days of Republican majority in this House we had this contention as to tariff commissions before us, and during the progress of that bill I introduced an amendment in which I proposed a bipartisan commission instead of a commission to be appointed by the President and to report to him. I proposed in that resolution that the members should be appointed one by the majority of the House, one by the minority of the House, one by the majority of the Senate, one by the minority of the Senate, and the other by the President of the United States.

But the same gentlemen who are industriously clamoring for a nonpartisan tariff commission now opposed that amendment bitterly, and it was defeated by a vote of nine. I believe this country needs some sort of a board or commission to ascertain from time to time the need of tariff revision and to so report

to the tariff-making body. I have long believed so, but the Republican idea of delegating all that authority to the President, the leader of their party, that he may constitute a partisan commission to report to him, thus giving the Congress of the United States such portion of the report as he chooses and throwing the balance into the Potomac River if he chooses, is no sort of a commission that will satisfy the business interests of the United States.

If the business men of this country are asking anything at all in this line, they are asking that a commission shall be appointed, as the Democrats propose, which will give to the country a businesslike report which will enable Congress to reach fair, honest, and legitimate conclusions. And I want to repeat what I have before said on this question, that a strictly partisan commission will not satisfy; a nonpartisan board is out of the question, because all tariff experts have partisan opinions; and so the best thing we can do is to permit the parties in the House and Senate to select the tariff board membership, so that each party will have fair representation on the board of experts. No other method of tariff board creation will convince the country that its reports are full and complete. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I am much surprised to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] express a lack of confidence in the present President of the United States.

During the last Congress we upon this side proposed the appointment of a nonpartisan tariff commission by the President of the United States. Then we had a Republican President. We had confidence that in appointing the tariff board he would throw aside politics and look only to qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, before this bill shall finally pass there will be a motion from this side of the House proposing a tariff commission to be appointed by the Democratic President of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side] Are you afraid of your own President, that he will appoint a partisan commission, as the gentleman from Indiana now suggests? We apparently have more confidence in your President than you have.

Now, with reference to what the gentleman from New York said with reference to the defeat of the tariff-commission bill two years ago. It is not true that the Sixty-first Congress did not pass that bill until the dying hours of the session. The RECORD will show that the bill was passed through the House in ample time for the Senate to consider it and to be sent back to the House before final action long before the 4th day of March.

But the RECORD also shows that Republicans in the Senate of the United States tried day after day to secure consideration in that body of that tariff-commission bill, and there was objection always upon the part of Democrats there. It was only in the closing days of the session that they were successful in securing a consideration of the bill. It was passed upon the morning of the 4th day of March, and on the 4th day of March, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] well knows, through the activity of himself and others and through a deliberate violation of the rules by the then Speaker of the House, the bill failed, or it would have been a law to-day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am not accustomed to making statements here that are not accurate, and even if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] makes the assertion, it does not in any way impair the accuracy of what I have said. I repeat that in the dying hours of the Sixty-first Congress the Republican side of the House attempted to pass a tariff commission bill. I know whereof I speak, despite the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin. That bill came back from the Senate the day before, or rather the Committee on Rules met the day before Congress adjourned and adopted a rule to consider the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. It came back the same morning.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The bill came back early in the morning, and Republicans delayed and deferred calling the bill up. If those in charge on that side of the House—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not want to misstate the facts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not misstating the facts.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken in making the statement he does.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not misstating the facts. I left the Chamber at 8 o'clock in the morning to get breakfast, upon the assurance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALLZELL, that the bill would not be called up while I was in the restaurant.

Mr. MANN. It had not come over at that time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was here at that time.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Then I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). In what way?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has already addressed himself to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The gentleman was already upon his feet and had addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Chairman, a point of order never comes too late.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But if the gentleman is afraid to have the truth stated and the point of order is good, I will take my seat.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I made the point of order for the purpose of attracting the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will state that I supposed that when the gentleman rose to his feet another paragraph of the bill had been read since he last spoke.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask my friends upon this side not to speak twice on one paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I do not make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it was while I was at breakfast, Mr. Chairman, between 8 o'clock and half past 8 o'clock, that the bill was called up. It is ridiculous to allege that that old autocratic machine between half past 8 o'clock in the morning and 12 o'clock noon could not have concurred in one Senate amendment and have agreed to it and have passed the bill. The truth of the matter is that the gentlemen over there were not sincere. They were just trying to fool the country in their belated performance. More than that, Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has said, I wish to say that, for one, I am opposed to any so-called tariff board or tariff commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a mere pretense to aid in enacting legislation along the lines of a protective tariff. The only reason for ascertaining the cost of production here and abroad and measuring tariff rates by that difference is to give protection to the manufacturer. According to the views which I hold, according to my opinion of how a tariff should be levied, I am not in favor of writing a tariff bill so as to afford protection to the manufacturer. More than that, many of those who are clamoring for protection do not need it. We are selling the products of our factories in every country in competition with the foreign manufacturers right at their doors. Such gentlemen do not need protection to enable them to meet the foreign manufacturers, but they desire it for the purpose of fleecing the American public. Gentlemen from New England have been protesting against putting boots and shoes on the free list and claim that the European manufacturers can lay their output down in Boston as cheaply as can the New England manufacturers, and yet none of them has ever been able to explain something that has been recently called to my attention, and that is that they are paying a duty of thirty-odd per cent on the shoes and shipping them into Canada and meeting European manufacturers in competition in Canada. Perhaps some gentlemen who represent the New England boot and shoe industries will be able to state how it is that the American manufacturer can ship into Canada and pay the duty and meet competition—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I can not yield—and yet can not meet competition at his own door in Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the statements of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who has just addressed the House, are so unlike him, so unfair, so misleading that I do not think they ought to go uncontroverted. The tariff commission bill passed this House in, I believe, January, and went to the Senate. Its passage in the Senate is admitted to have been delayed by Democratic opposition. That bill came back to the House on the 4th of March. Final adjournment necessarily took place at 12 o'clock noon. The House was in session all night the night of the 3d of March. Members had no time, were in insufficient numbers to constitute a quorum. There

were a number of appropriation bills in doubt as to getting through at all. A hot fight was on over the post-office bill, as I recall, and several others were in question. Those bills were being passed, if at all, by the House, so far as final conference reports were concerned, without a quorum. No one dared in the House at that time to raise the question of a quorum or of bringing up a question that required a quorum until business was further along and these appropriation bills were disposed of, because everyone here who knew anything about the House knew that it was not possible to get a quorum of this House together before 10 o'clock or half past 10 in the morning after an all-night session. The appropriation bills were finally disposed of and the tariff commission bill, which had come over from the Senate at the earliest possible moment from a legislative standpoint, was called up with a proposition to concur in the Senate amendments, not one amendment but amendments, and thereupon the other side of the House commenced a filibuster. Some gentleman here the other day, I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], unfairly, as it seemed to me, stated or intimated that we might turn the clock back in order to pass that commission bill. Mr. Chairman, it is a common thing to turn the clock back on the 4th of March for immaterial things, for the little final windup, but I think nobody has ever proposed to turn the clock back in violation, in effect, of the Constitution for the purpose of passing a hotly controverted political proposition. I was unwilling on that day, and would be now, to turn the clock back in violation of the Constitution for the purpose of passing any controverted proposition. Gentlemen seem to think that it is fair to criticize the then Speaker. He did everything in his power under the rules of the House at that time to agree to the Senate amendments so that the tariff commission bill should be passed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] here was doing everything within his power, but there came times in this House when a strong minority, ably led as that minority was at that time by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], can prevent speedy action by the House. I helped to give an illustration of that in the last session of Congress, when it took, as I told gentlemen on the other side it would take when it commenced, three hours and a half to approve the Journal of the House, and we did not have as large a minority as you had at this other time. But a strong minority, if they wish to filibuster, can delay action, and you wished to filibuster at that time and you were able to delay action by the House on the final morning after the Democrats in the Senate had delayed action in the Senate until the very last day.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, what is the truth about the tariff commission action on the morning of the 4th of March, 1911? The exact truth is—and the Record will bear it out—that the men who were standing sponsor for it on the Republican side were making a pretense, and Mr. FITZGERALD, leading the fight on the Democratic side, was openly against it. That tariff-commission bill went from this House to the Senate on January 11. It was held back in the Senate until the morning of March 4, when it came into this body and was offered expedition here by a resolution from the Committee on Rules which proposed to expedite it by moving that all votes on the Senate amendments should be taken in gross, a fact which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yesterday denied. Now, a filibuster was at once begun against it by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. In the midst of that filibuster—the fight being led on the Republican side by Mr. Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, who has been against the tariff commission, who was then against the tariff commission, and who, as shown in the records of Congress repeatedly, I think, spoke against the tariff commission—Mr. Dalzell asked in the midst of that fight on the previous question on the resolution for the ayes and noes.

Even that sort of a move would have been enough to have beaten the bill, but what further happened, as a matter of fact? Now, listen. Finally the resolution itself came to a vote. The yeas and nays were ordered and taken. As the gentleman knows, we call the roll here twice. For the only time, probably, in the history of the American Congress when the roll had been called for the first time this happened: Mr. Tawney, of Minnesota, a member of the machine, came in here with the conference report on the general deficiency bill, rose to his feet, got the recognition of the Speaker, Mr. Cannon, and on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments on the general deficiency bill another roll call was ordered. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] remembers this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and I protested against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. He certainly did protest, and made a point of order. When one roll call was half concluded—a roll call which would have given the people of the United States a tariff

commission if the Republican leaders had been in earnest in this matter—contrary to parliamentary practice, contrary to common sense, the Speaker allowed another motion to come in, and in the midst of one roll call another roll call was taken.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, that was also contrary to an express rule of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was contrary to every rule. It was in that hour that the Republican leaders of this House put this reform behind them. It was their chance. They had met the rebuke of the people in the preceding November election, and they had not learned their lesson, and they turned against it. The truth is that at this late hour the Republican leaders are trying to take up the thing they dropped. They were given their chance. They will not be given it again. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Most of the Democrats in this Chamber are against a tariff commission. I do not agree with them that a tariff commission is not a good thing, even for a tariff for revenue only; but they are open in their opposition; they are against a tariff commission. The Republican leaders of this body are pretending to be for a tariff commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Put them back in power, let this bill which the Democrats will pass bring disaster upon the country, and if by any misfortune the Republican leaders shall come back into power they will have no tariff commission. They will begin to revise the tariff in the same old way, getting their information from the men who want to be protected at the expense of the general public. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DIES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take the negative of the motion on which the gentleman has spoken, as a member of the committee. I claim the floor in preference to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts as a member of the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has evidently prepared that speech for this occasion. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now, every man who was present in this House on the memorable day of March 4, 1911—and only those people who were present understand the situation—is entitled to his opinion as to whether on that day the Republican leaders acted in good faith or not. In my opinion, everything on our side was done in good faith and with the intention of passing the bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who interrupted a moment ago, whether or not, in his judgment, the Republican Party was acting in good faith.

Mr. SHERLEY. In my judgment, there was not the slightest excuse, and I so stated then and have said repeatedly, publicly and privately, for the ruling of the Chair, in the face of a direct rule, that it was in order to stop a roll call to receive a conference report from the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Tawney.

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely the Chair may have been mistaken in his rulings; but I asked the gentleman from Kentucky whether he thought the leaders were acting in good faith, and he has not answered.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer that their action was taken so late that almost any opposition was sufficient to prevent success attending their efforts—

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman has not answered. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] if, in his opinion, the Republican leaders were in earnest that day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my judgment about it is that there never was a Republican leader in this House that was in favor of that tariff commission. [Loud and prolonged applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is a great deal of misapprehension about the position of various gentlemen and of the two parties about a tariff commission. I am against it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is, against an outside body that is not made responsive to the House of Representatives.

Here is the situation: The Constitution of the United States devolves upon the House of Representatives the duty of making revenue bills—that is, of introducing them. The Senate can not do it. Therefore it is the House of Representatives

which primarily needs the information on the subject of the tariff.

The second step is consideration of revenue bills by the Senate.

The last body that has anything to do with the tariff bill is the President. Now, what is the sense, or what ever was the sense, in spending four or five hundred thousand dollars—I believe it was \$250,000 a year—to get up a tariff board to instruct the President of the United States on the details of the tariff bills? I will tell you who needs the instruction and the information, and that need is constant. It is the House of Representatives. [Applause.] We are the ones who need it.

The statement has been lugged in here that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] voted for a tariff commission; and if the gentleman who made the statement had gone up the column a little further he would have found my name. But we never did vote for the tariff commission that they have been talking about. We never did anything of the sort.

I have stated it three or four times on the floor of this House. Here is what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself and the other Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee did: We induced the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to agree to make it responsive to the House, and then we brought in a unanimous report here. Afterwards one gentleman changed his notion about it, as he had a perfect right to do, and then they started an agitation around here, and the first thing that the gentleman from Alabama and myself knew they rolled us most thoroughly. [Laughter.] I mean the Democrats, now, not the Republicans. Of course, the Republicans were standing by and consenting, like Saul at the stoning of Stephen. [Laughter.] But they actually rolled up a majority against Brother UNDERWOOD and myself on the Democratic side, and it was the first time and the last time they ever did it. The only reason they did it then was that they caught us napping. [Laughter.] We were so certain we were right that we did not believe anybody would object to it; but we changed our opinion the next day. [Laughter.]

Here is the Democratic position about this board, or commission, or whatever you please to call it: We welcome information on the tariff question and solicit it from any source under heaven that is reliable. It is an interminable job. Nobody ever gets through with it. My venerable friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has participated in four tariff revisions here. This is the fifth tariff revision in which he has helped one way or another, and he is still a learner. When I came here 20 years ago I thought I knew all about the tariff. I have been studying it ever since, and I feel to-day as Sir Isaac Newton said he felt after studying philosophy all his life—like a boy walking up and down the seashore picking up shells. You never get through with it. Here is what I am in favor of, and I know it is what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is in favor of, because we have talked about it hundreds of times. We are in favor of the Ways and Means Committee, upon whom we devolve the duty of making tariff bills, having all the expert help that it needs. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not care whether it is 1 expert or 40; if it needs them, I will vote the money to-morrow, and I would have voted it when the Republicans controlled this House. Whenever the bureau which the gentleman from Alabama talks about is vitalized, as it is going to be very shortly, then a large part of the expert tariff work is provided for. One word more. No man who was in this House on the 4th of March, 1911—of which occasion so much has been said—will ever forget that transaction while the world lasts.

I have seen this House in a rage time and time again, but I never saw the Democratic side of it so enraged as it was that day. It verged on riot. I violate no confidence in saying that my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], whom I highly esteem, came to me and suggested that I prepare a resolution thanking Mr. Speaker Cannon at the close of the session, and I prepared it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes, not to constitute a precedent for the remainder of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank my friend from Illinois and the committee. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], as I say, asked me to prepare a resolution thanking Speaker

Cannon, and I did it. I was glad to do it. It was all arranged that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] should preside and I would offer the resolution, make a speech, and everything would be lovely. [Laughter.] Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] led that fight about this Tariff Board, and then the Democratic side of the House got madder about Mr. Speaker Cannon's ruling than I ever saw it, even about an election case, and you new Members will find out that that is one of the most irritating subjects that ever comes up in the House. The situation became so serious that I went to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and told him that I could not offer the resolution; that if I did the Democrats would throw me out of the window. [Laughter.] I told him that he would have to do it himself. So it went along that way for a few minutes and then some gentleman—I have forgotten whether it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dalzell—withdrew the bone of contention, and the effect of it was like the sun breaking through an April shower. Everybody got into a good humor on our side of the House, and in a few minutes I offered a resolution thanking Speaker Cannon, and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. It was almost 12 o'clock and we were calling the roll, not on a final vote but on a motion to recommit. I went to the gentleman from New York and one or two other gentlemen on this side of the House opposed to the gentleman from Missouri, and said that the clock would not be turned back for the purpose of passing any controverted proposition. That was agreed upon, otherwise there would have been a riot in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. There is no question about it. Gentlemen who were not here do not understand the feeling. That having been agreed to, so far as we could agree to it at least, I went to the gentleman from New York and said to him, "It is impossible to pass this amendment by 12 o'clock. We can not afford to have a riot in the House. We will not finish up our other business if this matter is set before the House," and the gentleman from New York withdrew his proposition.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Missouri state how many minutes it lacked to 12?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was right around 12.

Mr. MANN. The clock was not turned back at all, and the matter was disposed of immediately after. Those gentlemen who were criticizing immediately came in and then found that instead of being 12 o'clock it was a little after 11 o'clock.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman from Missouri mean to say that in view of the history of this matter and what occurred that day I was not in earnest in trying to pass these amendments through the House and using every power I could command to do it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I will not say anything of the sort. I will tell the gentleman what I will say, and I believe it is absolutely true, and that is that the gentleman from New York had experienced a change of heart about the commission, and that day he was trying to get that bill through here—

A MEMBER. What about Dalzell?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will not speak of him, for he is not here.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Missouri has left the impression on this House that in his opinion there was a conspiracy afoot that day on the Republican side to defeat that bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; I have never stated that.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman, in answer to my question whether the Republican side was trying to pass the bill—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was not the question the gentleman from Massachusetts asked.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Missouri may be technically correct, but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] had given the House to understand that there was a conspiracy afoot on the Republican side and that we deliberately planned to seem to wish to pass the tariff-board bill that day and yet did not intend to pass it. I asked the gentleman from Missouri whether that was so?

And half the House roared with delight when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] evaded the question by saying that in his opinion no Republican leader had ever wanted to pass that bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there were plenty of Republicans in the House then, a great many of whom were honestly in favor of a tariff commission. The gentleman from

Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] was. He is now a leader in this House. I do not think he, at that time, would rate himself as a leader on the tariff question. That is not said in bad temper or anything of the sort. The gentleman from Massachusetts has fine capacity, and I congratulate him on his promotion to the great Committee on Ways and Means. I was talking about the men who were running the Committee on Ways and Means upon the tariff question, the leaders on that subject March 4, 1911.

Mr. GARDNER. On that day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, that day.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was not the thing the gentleman was asking about.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the point I am asking the gentleman to answer. The gentleman from Kansas charges a conspiracy upon that day. Does he charge us justly?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was honest on that day.

Mr. GARDNER. No; but was there a conspiracy?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell the gentleman what I think. I think that some Republicans were in favor of a tariff commission, and that some of them were as bitterly opposed to it as I was.

Mr. GARDNER. I know; but was there a conspiracy on that day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not tell, because I was not in it if there was one. [Prolonged laughter.] I can not tell, therefore, I never charged any conspiracy. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] preferred that charge.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman does not have to tell. I ask him what he thinks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never charged there was a conspiracy.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman will not answer the question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat, that Democrats welcome information on the tariff question from any reliable source under heaven, and after we get all we can get we will not have enough, and neither would the Republicans, because the subject is absolutely inexhaustible. I once learned something on the tariff question, and a very important thing, from a man from whom I was not seeking information, and that was this, that the railroads had a very great interest in the tariff question. That was 20 years ago. I never had thought about their having any more interest in the tariff question than any other large business institution that was not engaged in manufacturing. It was in the Christmas time between 1893 and 1894, when we were framing the Wilson bill. This gentleman said that if we put coal on the free list, West Virginia and Maryland would both go Republican. He said that we would recoup among the farmers for what we lost among the miners, but that the great transportation lines running through those two States would go over, body and breeches, to the Republicans, because they made their living by hauling coal to the Atlantic seaboard and that free coal would give that trade to the Nova Scotia mines. And, Mr. Chairman, if he had been Elijah, and all the rest of the major prophets rolled into one, he could not have hit it better, because West Virginia has been Republican ever since and Maryland hanging on by her eyelids. [Laughter.] So, if you are busy about it you can secure tariff information from almost everywhere.

One other thing and then I am going to quit. I want experts to help this Committee on Ways and Means, to help the House, and they are the ones who ought to have it. There is no such thing as a nonpartisan board. It is an impossibility in nature. It is a thing incredible that any man who is fit to sit on a tariff board has no political opinions which lead him into some sort of affiliation with some political party in this country. As far as I am individually concerned, if I were making up a tariff board or a board of tariff experts, you could rely upon the fact that it would have a working Democratic majority, because I believe in the Democratic theory, and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or any of the rest of them were making up a tariff board they would put a Republican majority on it. That is all there is to it. I hope, Mr. Chairman, it will never be again charged on the floor

of this House that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and incidentally myself, ever voted for this thing that they call a tariff commission, as it is popularly understood in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not willing to let go unanswered the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that in response to an inquiry I made him an equivocal answer. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Speaker of this House, has well said that that was a day of intense excitement. It was. The memory of what happened is stamped indelibly upon the minds of those who were present on what to me was the most exciting day I ever experienced in my 10 years of service here. In my judgment this is the actual fact. There never was a time when those in control of the majority on that side of the House were believers in the tariff board. The President of the United States was a very sincere believer in it, as I have always been and now am, because for my part I still favor a tariff board, and I am glad that I had something to do with creating the language that makes a practical tariff board out of the Department of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Now, with the position of the President of the United States being what it was, it became necessary for certain leaders upon this floor to get into harmony of action with the President. Therefore they became, as his representatives here, as the party's representatives, the advocates of a tariff board, but in my humble judgment there could have been no other subject under the sun up at that time on which a roll call could have been interrupted by recognition from the Chair of a gentleman to offer a conference report and thereby bring on another roll call, except that one question of a tariff board. Now, there is a great deal of difference between men being for a proposition legislatively and being for it because they believe in it in their heart of hearts, and there were many men here on this floor, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows and as I know, who in their heart of hearts did not believe in a tariff commission, but the exigency of politics and the position of the leader of their party, the then President of the United States, forced them into that sort of position. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to use the word "equivocal" in a disagreeable sense. I mean the gentleman did not answer the question exactly as it was put.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, I did not answer it the way the gentleman wanted me, and I admit that now, but I think I did answer it the way it was put. Now, this is true. It is true those men at that late hour were pushing the bill forward, but my answer was strictly accurate—that their conversion was such a deathbed conversion that it gave no possibility, with any sort of opposition, that they would be able to carry through the object that they undertook.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman now answer me this question—and let me preface it by saying that it often happens in this House that men do their best to pass bills in which they do not believe in order to carry out a party policy: Granting, if the gentleman chooses, that the tariff-board bill was unnecessarily delayed in the Senate—it may have been, for all I know—granting that a great many Republicans were opposed to it—I know a great many were opposed to it—

Mr. SHERLEY. I trust the gentleman will come to his question; I have only five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I think the House is willing to hear the gentleman's answer. The gentleman has heard this morning from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] a distinct charge that the Republican leaders on the 4th of March, 1911, were playing false; that at that time they were deliberately not trying to pass the bill. Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the intense excitement it was quite possible that even Mr. Speaker Cannon might admit a roll call which was out of order, and which we all know was out of order. I want to ascertain the gentleman's impression whether or not that was merely a stage play or whether the Republican side of the House on that day was legislatively doing all that it could—your side trying to resist to its utmost—to pass that bill, because it is a grave charge which the gentleman from Kansas has made. He was present, I was present, and the gentleman was present, and we have opposing opinions. What I wish to know is, Were we scoundrels?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not hold a brief either for the gentleman from Kansas or the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I decline to be put in a position of undertaking to testify to the inner motives of the leaders of the Republican Party.

This I say to the gentleman, and I would say more if some of the men who were actors in that scene were here present, that I believe there could have been no other subject up, which being up could have been interrupted by recognition by

the Chair of the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Tawney, to present a conference report.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman think that the Chair was trying to beat that bill by the lapse of time?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have stated the facts. The gentleman can draw his own conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, one moment. I would like to have the gentlemen finish their discussion on this question, but I would like to close, and without objection I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to have time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, I will extend the time to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is the paragraph? Is it paragraph 29, to strike out 10 cents a pound?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course closing the debate on this paragraph will not close debate on this subject unless the gentleman enforces the rest of the rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing for the House to work out the debate on this and get rid of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I reserved the right to object in order to see whether I could get some kind of an understanding with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for the benefit of the committee. How far does the gentleman desire the committee to proceed to-day with this bill before we adjourn?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope we will get through many pages before we adjourn to-night, but I recognize that this is a question that gentlemen want to debate. I have no desire to unduly cut it off, but I would like to reach some agreement about the time for such debate. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] desire to speak, and if there is any other gentleman on that side of the House who wishes to speak I will extend the time. I ask unanimous consent, reserving five minutes to this side, that the time for debate on this paragraph be closed in 15 minutes, with the understanding that we will go on with the bill at the end of that time.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to know if the gentleman could not assure us that if we would be very good in school and we would be able to finish the chemical schedule, which is one of the difficult schedules in the bill, at half past 6, we could not get out this evening?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I would prefer to have night sessions for the present.

Mr. MANN. I should prefer not to have.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the charge made by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is one of the most serious a Member could make against his colleagues on the floor of the House. I was present during the entire night of March 3 and the morning of March 4, 1911—two years ago.

I am a little surprised, on account of the political history of the time, that such a charge would be made by him dating back for two years. I say what I am about to say with the most kindly feeling for my friend, for he is my friend. The Republican Party was not hopelessly abandoned to all that is honorable and fair, even last summer and fall. He secured a nomination from it in the last campaign and secured an election to this House, and the seat that he now holds, as a Republican candidate upon the Republican ticket. If it was good enough for his purpose last fall, it was not so bad two years ago and now as he says.

But upon the question of the tariff commission I think I speak advisedly as to the sincerity of the Republican Party. I speak with all sincerity when I say that it is my confident belief that upon the 4th of March, 1911, everything was done that could be done to secure the passage of a tariff-commission law. We have just heard a description of the almost tragic opposition that was made to that bill upon the Democratic side of the House. There never has been a time when the conditions were so acute in the House during my service here as upon that day. The opposition was more determined that day upon that bill than upon any other bill or any other question during the 10 years I have been in this House.

I had studied the sentiment of gentlemen upon this side, because long before the birth of the Progressive Party, long before any other gentleman upon this floor was in favor of a tariff commission, I introduced a bill providing for such a commission. I introduced the first bill for that purpose as far back as December 11, 1906, and have been reintroducing such a bill in every Congress since, and have been earnestly advocating its becoming a law.

And I have canvassed during the years that have intervened since 1906 the sentiment of the membership of this House, and I have seen the Members changing from a position of united opposition, from the White House down to the Members on the Committee on Ways and Means, to a position of advocacy.

The White House in 1906 was opposed or indifferent to a tariff commission. I prepared and brought here in November of that year a bill authorizing the creation of such a commission. I took it to President Roosevelt and urged him to favor such a commission in his message of December, 1906. He refused to mention it in his message. I went to the Committee on Ways and Means. I could get no consolation from them. But, as I say, working among the membership, talking with the Members and urging the measure, I have been gratified to see the sentiment, not only of the Committee on Ways and Means but the sentiment of the Republican Members of the House, change from a unanimous sentiment against the establishment of a tariff commission to a position in favor of it; and I am gratified now to learn that Mr. Roosevelt, after his retirement from the Presidency and after he became the leader of a new political party that was born in August last, has become the advocate of a tariff commission that he refused to favor when he was President. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, there has been such a variety of descriptions here as to what took place in the House on the memorable 4th day of March, 1911, that I am reminded of Carlyle's saying, "History is a distillation of rumor." For what would a future historian write as to the occurrences on that 4th of March if, picking up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day, he should read the statements of gentlemen testifying from mere general recollections without having consulted the RECORD to ascertain the exact facts?

I was present in the House on that day and saw all that transpired. But before speaking of this, I desire first to call the attention of both sides of the Chamber to a statement in Hinds' Precedents touching the rules and procedure of the House relating to roll calls:

When once begun the roll call may not be interrupted even by a motion to adjourn, a parliamentary inquiry, a question of personal privilege, the arrival of the time fixed for another order of business or for a recess, or the presentation of a conference report. But it is interrupted for the reception of messages and upon the arrival of the hour fixed for adjournment sine die. Incidental questions arising during the roll call, such as the refusal of a Member to vote, are considered after the completion of the call and before the announcement of the vote.

Observe that it is thus expressly declared that a roll call can not be interrupted, even for the presentation of a conference report. Who knew that such were the rules and precedents of the House? Every Member of the House on that day knew it. Never before had the House seen a violation of the rules similar to the one perpetrated on that day. The Clerk had called the roll for the first time on the bill containing the provision for a tariff commission. When the first call had been completed, and as the Clerk was about to begin the second—I know that my recollection is correct, because I went to the House library and consulted the RECORD—Mr. Tawney, a close friend of the Speaker, and as close a friend of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], a persistent filibusterer against the tariff commission, brought in a conference report on the general deficiency bill and moved its passage in the midst of the unfinished roll call. The yeas and nays were called for on Mr. Tawney's motion. Thereupon ensued a very remarkable scene. Never has the House witnessed greater indignation upon both sides of the Chamber than was displayed here when Members saw that the Speaker was about to permit a violation of the rules of the House.

And he did permit it. The roll call then in progress was interrupted and a new roll call begun and taken on the conference report on the general deficiency bill in absolute violation of rules and precedents. When this new roll call had been completed the House then resumed the roll call on the bill which contained the provision for a tariff commission.

I make no accusation, but if asked the question which has been put here I will answer it. I will not evade it. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman believe that the Republican leaders were for a tariff commission?

Mr. COOPER. I believe that two or three who had it in their power to do it deliberately entered into an agreement which pre-

vented the consideration of that bill. [Applause.] The attention of the House was called to the rule that a roll call could not be interrupted even for the presentation of a conference report. But the roll call was interrupted—

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I attempted to make the point of order at the time, and the Speaker declined to entertain it.

Mr. COOPER. Oh, it was made over and over here without avail, and the RECORD shows that the Speaker, to restore some semblance of order so that he could get that roll call to go on, directed the Sergeant at Arms to take the mace and command order, and that the Sergeant at Arms obeyed and carried it out to the head of the center aisle.

Now, does any gentleman pretend that it was the friends of the tariff commission who secured the interruption of that roll call and brought on that scene?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the Clerk resume the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

30. Ethers: Sulphuric, 4 cents per pound; amyl nitrite, 20 per cent ad valorem; amyl acetate and ethyl acetate or acetic ether, 5 cents per pound; ethyl chloride, 20 per cent ad valorem; ethers and esters of all kinds not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it has occurred to me that this paragraph relating to "ether" suggests a proper amendment at this time. We ought to have "ether" free and cheap, so as to peacefully and painlessly put to sleep the men who persist in occupying the time of this body by fighting old and ancient battles over again. [Laughter.]

I confess to be somewhat amused and confused by the reminiscences indulged in, and still more confused and amused by the position taken by the gentlemen of the majority on the question of the tariff board or tariff commission, or whatever you like to call it. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], as I understand him, and the Speaker of the House favor a partisan tariff bureau. Why they should favor a partisan bureau, why the bureau of experts should be under the control of the Ways and Means Committee, is beyond my comprehension. I can not understand why men would desire the services of experts, who by virtue of their appointment or position would be considered partisan experts, on a great matter of general legislation which concerns the welfare of all the people, and industrial conditions generally. [Applause on the Republican side.] Partisan experts are hired in bad lawsuits to prove things that are not true. Partisan experts will do party politics in their reports and prove worthless.

Mr. Chairman, I am still more confused by the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who, if I understand him rightly, says he is against any tariff board. He does not need information. And I am still more confused by other points of view on the other side of the Chamber as to this matter. The gentleman from Alabama says he wants information. We all want information. Everyone concurs in that view. Men can not legislate intelligently upon a great subject like this in the absence of accurate information. But the gentleman from Alabama says "we want a competitive tariff." Other gentlemen on the other side say "We want a tariff for revenue; what we want is to secure revenue by virtue of these customs duties, and the matter of protection has nothing to do with it." Therefore they oppose a tariff board and disregard the facts. One idea conflicts with the other.

Mr. Chairman, if men will have information they must have it through a board that is nonpartisan, composed of intelligent, brave, courageous men who will not do the will or the bidding of any Ways and Means Committee or of any President, for partisan purposes, but who will ascertain judicially the facts that are concerned in the matter. And, furthermore, if we are to have competition, I assert that the competition must be based upon an intelligent consideration of the actual facts showing the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. There can be no competition if the tariff is so high as to shut out importations. There can be no competition if the tariff is so low as to destroy American industry. Gentlemen from Kentucky and from Texas talk here about the farmer. But in this connection they do not really concern themselves with the interests of the agriculturists of this country, as is shown by this bill. It is unfair to the farmers and to the West. I confess I am amazed that men should stand here, responsible

leaders of the majority, and say to gentlemen on this side, "You have been repudiated; you have no part in this great work." I want to say in reply that that statement is not true. I myself stand here as a representative of the whole great State of Minnesota, elected by a majority approximating 85,000 votes, more than 2 to 1 over my Democratic opponent and almost 2 to 1 over all opponents combined. I have not been repudiated by the people of my State. I have a sacred right to stand upon this floor and plead the cause of the people of my State. I have a right to be heard in the making of this law. I have a right to represent the interests of farmers and laborers and business interests of my State, and it is unfair and unjust to say, because forsooth a mix up in the Republican Party has brought an overwhelming majority on that side, that we have, or our point of view has, been repudiated. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not true; it is not honest; it is not patriotic.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

36. Glycerin, crude, not purified, 1 cent per pound; refined, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 26, after the word "refined," strike out the numeral "2" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "3".

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment for the purpose of calling on the unfeeling good humor and courtesy of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] who has charge of this bill. I am going to ask him if he will give the minority Members in this House some information had when the schedule was adopted, and tell us under what theory they revised the tariff and put 2 cents a pound on refined glycerine which under the Payne bill was 3 cents a pound and under the present bill 2 cents a pound.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to my friend that the rate of 3 cents a pound on refined glycerine is practically prohibitive, and it was in the hope that we would induce a more substantial import of refined glycerine that the rate is proposed to be reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents. I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman. I would like to see a further reduction made. I have an apprehension that we have not gone far enough to induce any substantial importation of refined glycerine. The ad valorem equivalent of refined glycerine at 2 cents a pound, however, is the same as the ad valorem on crude glycerine at 1 cent a pound, and under those circumstances that is the proper balance.

Mr. COPLEY. Does the gentleman believe that a rate of 3 cents a pound has worked to the detriment of the American public and given undue profit to the American manufacturer?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman must recognize the fact that our primary motive in fixing these tariff rates is to collect some revenue, and 3 cents a pound on refined glycerine is practically prohibitive.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield, in looking at the handbook of information which gentlemen of the committee have furnished for the guidance of the rest of us, I notice that there were imported in 1912 under this item 3,893 pounds, and the estimate of the gentleman's expert of the amount that will be imported is still less.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from South Dakota is correct in the reading of the figures, but I will state that I did not make the estimate, and I believe they have underestimated the probable amount of imports. Moreover, the import figures are misleading because the greater portion of refined glycerine is imported in bond and reexported.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Well, the revenue which it is estimated to produce is less than that of last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that that is an average estimate based on a number of preceding years and not simply the last year. It is estimated that instead of \$1,533 we will get \$3,500.

Mr. COPLEY. How do you estimate an increase of revenue by a decrease of the rate and a decrease of importations?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I have said to the gentleman that the figures given as to the amount of pounds imported are evidently misleading.

Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances and upon the information given, I insist on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gums: Amber, and amberoid unmanufactured, or crude gum, \$1 per pound; arabic, or senegal, one-half cent per pound; camphor, crude, natural, 1 cent per pound; camphor, refined and synthetic, 5 cents per

pound; chicle, 20 cents per pound; dextrine, burnt starch or British gum, dextrine substitutes, and soluble or chemically treated starch, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the chemical bill submitted to the House a year ago there was included in this paragraph copal, gum resin, kauri, damar, lac, crude, seed, button stick, and shell. These articles are now on the free list. On this bill they are on the free list. In your bill passed by the House a year ago they were put on the dutiable list. At that time I offered an amendment striking them out of the dutiable list and restoring them to the free list, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in charge of the bill then and in charge of the bill now, made this remark:

I should gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that his constituents are in the habit of consuming gum kauri, damar, and amberoid. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

As a matter of fact, these gums are the constituent materials in the making of varnish, and what the consuming public uses is the varnish from which they are made. Now, we have very carefully reduced the rates of taxation upon varnish so that the manufacturer shall not unload upon the public the tax that we are laying on the manufacturer. The time has come to put an end to this school of economics whereby people are taught to look upon a tariff as a benefit. Taxation is not a benefit, but a burden; and now we are going to place upon the manufacturers their share of the burden.

And yet, now they put it upon the free list in conformity with the amendment which I offered a year ago. The gentleman has experienced a change of heart. Last year he proposed to end this school of economics and place the tax upon the manufacturer. Now, he proposes to continue the school of economics and admit the articles free of duty, as they are under the existing law.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that he is going to vote for this tariff bill. He seems to believe that he has written the whole thing, and I am all the more induced to believe that he might vote for a Democratic bill because he found himself unable to vote for a Republican bill when the Payne bill was reported to the House.

I have already explained to the gentleman why we were able to restore to the free list a great many taxes that were proposed to be levied last year. I shall not detain him or tax the patience of the committee by detailing that further, but surely in discussing the rates of duty on varnish, which is made from these various gums produced in the East Indies and in Mexico, he has not overlooked the fact that in this bill we have further reduced our proposed rates on varnish from 25 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 7, after the word "pound," insert the following: "Provided, That dextrine, burnt starch, or British gum, dextrine substitutes, and soluble or chemically treated starch, when made from potato starch, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only one moment, and I rise in large part as a matter of inquiry. My amendment is concerned with only the last two lines of section 37. Looking ahead to paragraph 239 of the act, we find that starch made from potatoes is dutiable at the rate of 1 cent per pound. I understand that dextrine and the various other commodities referred to in that connection are, in large measure at least, made from potato substance; and I rise to inquire why, in view of that fact, there should be a less duty upon the manufactured product than there is upon the raw material of that product.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in saying that some dextrine is made from potato starch, but there is some loss in substance in making this transfer, and the rates of duty of 1 cent a pound upon potato starch are pretty fairly balanced by the rate of duty of three-fourths of a cent per pound upon the finished product of that starch, namely, dextrine; but the gentleman overlooked the fact that by far the greater bulk of the starch in this country is made from sago or tapioca flour, which is on the free list. This affords a large differential.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman will notice that my amendment is so phrased as to deal only with the potato starch, and I think that overcomes the second portion of the gentleman's suggestion. As to the first portion, the manufacturers from my section of the country say that the protection is hopelessly inadequate and have asked for a protection of 1½ cents per pound. The former duty was 1½ cents, and my amendment calls for a duty of 1 cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague a question in reference to that. I understood the gentleman

to say that there was a quantity of starch wasted in making dextrine.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I said there was some quantity.

Mr. PAYNE. What? A quarter of a pound?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I can not answer the gentleman correctly. There might be 15 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Suppose there might be a quarter of a pound, for the sake of illustration. I want to see if I can get the gentleman's idea. Suppose there might be a quarter of a pound out of the starch used in making a pound of dextrine. At a cent a pound that would be a cent and a quarter duty on the starch. I trust I can get my colleague's attention.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PAYNE. If there was a quarter of a pound more starch used, or, say, a pound and a quarter, of starch used in making a pound of dextrine, then the duty on the starch used would amount to a cent and a quarter. Do I understand my colleague to say he has balanced that duty by charging only three quarters of a cent on dextrine?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will admit to the gentleman from New York that it is a very close calculation upon the manufacture of potato starch—

Mr. PAYNE. A close calculation? There is no calculation at all. I want to say to my gentlemanly colleague that if there is a duty of a cent and a quarter paid on a pound and a quarter of starch—and it takes that to make a pound of dextrine—in order to compensate for the duty on the starch there should be at least a cent and a quarter instead of three-quarters of a cent on the dextrine. It works that way; it does not work by subtraction, but by addition. I trust the gentleman understands.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I see what the gentleman aims at, and I will say that this rate is fixed for dextrine made of all kinds of starch, and without particular reference to the one kind to which the gentleman refers, and it is a perfectly fair disposition of the subject.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that dextrine is made, perhaps, exclusively from potato starch.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, largely so.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; that is not correct.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, whether it is made from either one, and it takes a pound and more to make a pound of dextrine, there should be a cent and more duty added to compensate in the dextrine for the use of the starch.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If we were writing a protection tariff, the gentleman is perfectly correct; but as we are not doing that, I am not convinced by his argument.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman is writing any kind of a tariff, he ought not to put on a greater duty and try to justify it by using subtraction instead of addition.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say it is not the purpose of this committee to create industries in this country by levying tariff taxes.

Mr. PAYNE. And you said it was not your purpose to destroy any legitimate industry. What have you got against the dextrine industry?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

38. Ink and ink powder, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, after line 8, insert the following:

"Par. 39. Indigo, natural or synthetic, dry or suspended in water, 10 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we are having here this afternoon the first object lesson in the new art of national legislation by party caucus. The people of the country, as well as Members of the House of Representatives, will know more about this system a little later than they know now, but a few features are already manifest, and the amendment which I have sent to the desk is illustrative at least of one step in the progress of this new system. The amendment which I have offered is taken as paragraph 39 of the original print of this bill as House bill 10, and it contains a 10 per cent ad valorem duty upon indigo and certain similar products. It has developed from the letter read by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] from a Member of the majority who attended the caucus that in the Democratic caucus he offered an amendment to this provision striking out

this 10 per cent paragraph and placing it upon the free list, and that he made a very eloquent, able, and convincing argument, but that the influence of the Ways and Means Committee overpowered his eloquence and his convincing statement in the Democratic caucus, and they voted him down by a vote of 112 to 54; and in his letter to his constituent he suggests that the proper relief now will be to seek relief in the Senate. But it crept out in the incidental debate that came out on the reading of the letter that he had done even better than that—not gone to the Democratic caucus again, but he has gone to the Ways and Means Committee, or certain members, a committee which is all powerful in this House until the other committees are appointed or suggested or nominated, and that he had his way outside of the caucus.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Would the gentleman like to get a correct statement of fact?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I am giving it correctly so far as it is out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The original proposition was voted down in the caucus. The Ways and Means Committee gave a careful consideration later on and reported back to the caucus, and the caucus placed this amendment in itself.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman from Alabama is correct in this latter statement, it is evident that the gentleman who wrote the letter was not aware it ever had gone to caucus again when the letter was written.

I am bound, I suppose, to take the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that it had gone back to the caucus. My impression after reading the letter was quite to the contrary. It illustrates that the Ways and Means Committee and its chairman are all potential in shaping up the tariff business. Why was a majority of the caucus against it? Again it comes to the caucus after certain suggestions have been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ], who is still sitting by the side of the manager of this schedule. He has been there most of the afternoon. He is not now a member of the Ways and Means Committee, but he may be later, I suppose.

Mr. METZ. I will not be here that long.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It would be enlightening to the country and to the membership of this House if the gentleman from New York in charge of this schedule, when the proper time comes, would elaborate the controlling reasons that placed the Democratic caucus on both sides of this question. I am wondering what those reasons were and what those inducements were, and I am wondering which way those gentlemen in caucus who voted both ways on this proposition will be found to vote now. I apprehend they will be voting with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

I am in very great doubt whether the system that the Democrats have brought upon us under cover of a committee on committees is not a species of oligarchy in government, more to be feared and avoided in Government institutions even than a one-man power, because when you have one man you can locate responsibility and know where to place it when things go wrong.

What is this? It is government by party caucus. There are 289 Democrats in this body, 126 Republicans, and 18 Progressives. That is, the latter confess to be Progressives. They are for progress, and they represent it all if you take their word for it. In that caucus at any time 145 men can control the absolute vote of this House upon the great questions pertaining to the revenues of the country and its economic conditions, under which men are to prosper or to go down in financial defeat. Yet it is the vote, at most, of only 145. You place that responsibility in the hands of the most powerful committee in this House, that has the initiation of the great revenue measures of the country. One hundred and forty-five Members of this House of 433 Members control the legislation of this body. It is a system the country will not stand for. It is not a step in the direction of reform, whatever may have been the herald or announcement made when it was set in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 59, yeas 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

41. Licorice, extracts of, in pastes, rolls, or other forms, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the fact that by this section licorice root, unground, is taken from the free list and placed upon the dutiable list, and also that further on in this bill the duty is reduced on the manufactured products of licorice, the whole proceeding being in accordance with the plan and theory upon which this bill is drawn. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], I will say that the situation which exists under the present law by which there is a high rate of duty on licorice paste, and licorice root is on the free list, has enabled the American manufacturers of licorice paste, who for the most part are subsidiary companies connected with the Tobacco Trust, to have an absolute monopoly of the American market; and the levying of a very small tax upon the licorice root and the reduction of the duty on licorice paste insures the fact that the manufacturers of licorice will not be able to hand on to the consuming public the tax that we have laid upon the raw material.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman think that the levying of a duty on the raw material will break up that monopoly?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; but I think they will pay some of the tax.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And then the gentleman believes in putting a higher rate of taxation on the manufactured article than on the raw product?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I do not think the gentleman from Iowa need concern himself about the subsidiary companies of the Tobacco Trust. That is what this is for.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The "gentleman from Iowa" is not concerned about that. He is concerned about the principle upon which this bill is based all through.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. This allows a very fair manufacturing margin between the tax on the licorice root and the tax on the licorice paste.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to my colleague [Mr. HARRISON of New York] that instead of trying to help any kind of legitimate business he is simply trying to help the business of the trusts.

Now, it is true that the Tobacco Trust manufactures and uses licorice in the United States; but there are some small concerns outside the trust that manufacture it in a small way, and in this readjustment of rates to make the manufacturer pay that tax, which drives the little fellows out of business, the trust would get the full benefit of it by supplying all the licorice used in the United States. That is the beauty of a tariff bill for revenue only, except for the trusts.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman did not do me the honor to heed the last part of my argument, or he would have seen that I maintain that we have left the licorice extract manufacturing business in this country in a position to continue the manufacture, but the tax will make them pay their taxes.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman will admit that the little fellows will be driven out by the duty and the big fellows will be able to stand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

42. Lime, citrate of, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. In the bill which was presented a year ago, the chemical schedule of the bill, paragraph 42, was the item of lemon juice, lime juice, and sour-orange juice at a rate of 10 per cent. Those articles are now on the free list.

I offered an amendment at that time to restore them to the free list. They are upon the free list of this bill, but when I offered the amendment a year ago the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], again outlining the policy of the Democratic Party, said:

We have placed a tax upon articles covered by this paragraph because they are chiefly used in the making of drinks at soda-water fountains, and therefore they are a proper subject for taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, those article, proper subjects for taxation, are placed on the free list, but there is no applause on the Democratic side. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I suppose, now, it is not needed to raise revenue. Then they wanted to put a tax on the soda-water fountains in order to raise revenue. Now, they find some other method of raising revenue. Pretty soon we shall find some place where they will put an increased tax, as they did on licorice root, over and above what they proposed a year ago. Then they proposed to tax licorice root, largely used by the youth of the land, at fifteen one-hundredths of a cent a pound. In this bill the rate is one-fourth of 1 cent a pound. They need that to raise revenue. Of course it evens up. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They put a tax on the licorice root that the boys chew, and then they take it off the soda water which they drink. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A slight difference, but after all what is the reason for it? Then it affected your principles. I suppose now the principles have been blown to the winds. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

45. Oils, rendered: Cod, cod, seal, herring, and other fish oil, not specially provided for in this section, 3 cents per gallon; whale oil, 5 cents per gallon; sperm oil, 8 cents per gallon; wool grease, including that known commercially as degrass or brown wool grease, crude and not refined or improved in value or condition, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound; refined or improved in value or condition, and not specially provided for in this section, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound; lanolin, 1 cent per pound; all other animal oils, rendered oils and greases, and all combinations of the same, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 9, line 22, by striking out the word "cod."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 24, page 9, the words "whale oil, 5 cents per gallon," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Whale oil, 8 cents per gallon."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get from the gentleman in charge of the bill at the present time some information as to why it is that the tariff of 8 cents per gallon on sperm oil under the present law is maintained in this bill, while the tariff on whale oil is reduced in this bill to 5 cents a gallon? There are many citizens of California engaged in the whaling industry, and for some years that industry has not been very prosperous. I am advised that any considerable reduction in the tariff will mean the going out of business of the large number of people who are engaged in it. I should like to know the reason that actuated the committee in reducing that particular item from 8 cents a gallon to 5 cents a gallon.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will state to the gentleman from California that, contrary to what we believe to be the correct usage, the present law taxes a number of different articles 8 cents a gallon, thus putting a specific tax upon the basket clause, which includes a number of different articles of different unit values. The effect of that was to apply a different rate of taxation to different oils. For instance, the unit of value put upon sperm oil, crude, is 42 cents a gallon; refined, 50 cents a gallon; and the unit of value upon whale oil is 31 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a gallon; so that in order to levy about the same rate of duty upon the two kinds of oil it is advisable either to apply an ad valorem rate to the basket clause or else to specify different specific rates for the different kinds of oil, and the committee have chosen the latter course.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

46. Oils, expressed: Alizarin assistant, sulphuricoleic acid, and ricinoleic acid, and soaps containing castor oil, any of the foregoing in whatever form, and all other alizarin assistants and all soluble greases used in the processes of softening, dyeing, or finishing, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; castor oil, 12 cents per gallon; flaxseed and linseed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, 12 cents per gallon of 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ pounds; poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, rapeseed oil, and peanut oil, 6 cents per gallon; hempseed oil, 3 cents

per gallon; almond oil, sweet, 5 cents per pound; sesame or sesamum seed or bean oil, 1 cent per pound; olive oil, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; olive oil, in bottles, jars, kegs, or other packages having a capacity of less than five standard gallons each, 30 cents per gallon; all other expressed oils and all combinations of the same, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 10, line 21, by inserting, after the word "kegs," the word "tins."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 20, page 10, the words "20 per cent ad valorem" and insert the words "40 cents per gallon."

In line 22, page 10, strike out the figure "30" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "50."

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to say that the olive industry is coming to be a very large industry in California, and that the profits on olive oil for the past years have often been considerably less than 20 cents a gallon. The provision in the present bill would reduce the tariff 20 cents a gallon. I have offered an amendment to maintain the present rate of duty. The bill reduces it from 50 to 30 cents a gallon, which, as I say, would take away all the profit and more than the profit made by the California olive-oil producers and put an end to the industry if that policy is to be pursued.

Last year we produced 800,000 gallons of olive oil. We have 12,000 acres planted to olive trees, one half of them in bearing and the other half not yet in bearing. It is an industry which, if allowed to develop, will in a few years come to produce all the olive oil and practically all the olives that we consume in this country. We believe it is in the interest of all the people of all sections of the country that that industry should be carried on upon our soil rather than in Italy and Spain. Therefore I offer the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have on several occasions debated this question with my good friend from California, and he has failed even yet to convert me to his point of view.

Mr. HAYES. And the gentleman from New York has failed to convert me to his point of view.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say that inasmuch as California produces only one-fifth of the olive oil consumed in the United States the rate of the duty of the present law was a heavy burden and hardship upon those people on the Atlantic seaboard who are of Mediterranean birth or ancestry and are accustomed to use olive oil where other people use butter. The proposition of the gentleman from California is to make the people of the East pay the freight rates from the Pacific coast on all the olive oil that is consumed in the East, and that is an unjust and improper method of tariff taxation.

Mr. HAYES. Is the gentleman from New York aware that the tariff amounts to 3½ cents on each small bottle usually sold to consumers? Does he think that this tax reduced or entirely taken away will decrease the cost of olive oil to the consumer? I do not. I want also to suggest that in the last three years we have increased the planting of olive orchards 1,000 acres per year, and if he will let us have an opportunity for a few years we shall be able to produce not only one-fifth of the olive oil used in this country but five-fifths.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from California is aware that the present rate of taxation is 35 to 40 per cent ad valorem, and that that is too high a tax upon the common food product consumed very largely by the poor of the cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 17, at the beginning of the line, strike out the words "peanut oil, 6 cents a gallon."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there is no competition in this country in the manufacture of peanut oil. The provision seems to be for the purpose of protection rather than for the purpose of revenue.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware that under existing law peanut oil is on the free list?

Mr. MOORE. I am informed that there is no competition in it.

Mr. MANN. It is on the free list, and it is proposed to put it on the taxable list.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask me a question?

Mr. MOORE. I would like to know whether the gentleman maintains that there is any competition in peanut oil.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Very little of it, if any, is made in this country. It is not made from peanuts grown in the Southern States. It is made from peanuts of an inferior kind unfit as a food product.

Mr. MOORE. They are grown in foreign countries?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In Africa and Japan.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask what is the necessity of a protection of 6 cents a gallon on peanut oil?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. This is not for the purpose of protection. There is so little of it produced here that it does not enter into the question from that point of view. It is a revenue proposition, and we expect to get from \$30,000 to \$40,000.

Mr. MOORE. But a duty has been left on the peanuts.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It has been reduced.

Mr. PAYNE. Is this peanut oil used as a substitute for butter?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. To some extent.

Mr. PAYNE. Then why does the gentleman put a duty upon it? It is a food product and you are going to relieve the consumer.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman knows that peanut butter is not used on the table of the people of this country; it is used more particularly in industry.

Mr. MANN. We use it on our table.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion and because I am for protection, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if peanut oil is being taxed as a revenue measure, I do not quite understand why the tax is reduced from 10 cents again, as carried in the chemical bill last year, to 6 cents a gallon in this bill. As a revenue proposition on an article not produced in this country, so it has to be imported, why could not you leave it as it was last year?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Because, I will say, we were able to remit some of the taxes that we then proposed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the House voted in reference to the tax on olive oil. Olive oil which is rendered unfit for food is now on the free list. Last year in this paragraph it was put on the dutiable list. I offered an amendment to restore it to the free list, and my distinguished friend from New York at that time said:

Mr. Chairman, in taking denatured olive oil from the free list we have placed upon it a tax of three-eighths of 1 cent a pound, which is about 3 or 4 per cent ad valorem. There is no reason why, if we tax the olive oil which is used as a food of the poor people, we should not place a revenue tax on the olive oil which is used by the manufacturer.

Does the gentleman stand for that, or does he repudiate it?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, if I were able to deliver my own speeches as well as the gentleman from Illinois does, perhaps the committee would not have put it on the free list. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Last year the committee did not put it on the free list, after having heard the gentleman's speech. They kept it on the dutiable list; but, having the attention of the gentleman called to it, as would have been more perfectly the case if we had had a tariff commission, the gentleman now proposes to put it on the free list. He retracts. He says now that we ought to tax the food but not tax the manufacturer. Last year he boldly avowed, and so led the gentlemen on the other side of the House, that if we taxed the food consumer we must tax the manufacturer. I like to see the gentleman consistent for more than one year at a time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to protest for a moment against this outrageous increase of rates over the present law. [Laughter.] Here is a food product on the free list in the present law, and they propose now to put on it a duty of 6 cents a pound, and so it is all along the line in this schedule, not only items by the score, but items in the aggregate. We imported in 1912 absolutely free of duty items to the amount of \$15,000,000, but in this schedule they are put on the dutiable list. Why, gentlemen, are you trying to revise the tariff upward? [Applause and laughter.] I am presenting more proof than you ever presented about the present tariff law, about revision upward—absolute proof. Are not you satisfied with the rates in the present bill, that you must increase them all along the line? [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague does not need to appeal to me as to what is

or is not a revision upward, because he is the leading expert on that subject in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. He was until the gentleman from New York came.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The fact is that the reason why he left the articles on the free list which we now propose to tax was because they are not produced in the United States, and it was of no benefit to any manufacturer in America to put a customs duty on them. That is the very reason we have taxed them—because we are making a tariff for revenue only, while he was making a tariff for the purpose of protecting the American manufacturer.

Mr. PAYNE. What became of your free food in this item—olive oil, the poor man's butter? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

47. Oils, distilled and essential: Orange and lemon, 10 per cent ad valorem; peppermint, 25 cents per pound; mace oil, 6 cents per pound; almond, bitter; amber; ambergris; anise or anise seed; bergamot; camomile; caraway; cassia; cinnamon; cedrat; citronella or lemon-grass; civet; fennel; jasmine or jasminine; juniper; lavender, and aspic or spike lavender; limes; neroli or orange flower; origanum, red or white; rosemary or anthos; attar of roses; thyme; and valerian; all the foregoing oils, and all fruit ethers, oils, and essences, and essential and distilled oils and all combinations of the same, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol shall be classified for duty under this paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 11, line 5, by striking out the word "or" and inserting the word "and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

49. Perfumery, including cologne and other toilet waters, articles of perfumery, whether in sachets or otherwise, and all preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, such as cosmetics, dentifrices, including tooth soaps, pastes, including theatrical grease paints, and pastes, pomades, powders, and other toilet preparations, all the foregoing wholly or partly manufactured; if containing alcohol, 40 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem; if not containing alcohol, 60 per cent ad valorem; floral or flower waters containing no alcohol, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I would like for a moment the undivided attention of my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. A few moments ago he challenged me about the statement I made that so many items in this bill will carry the increased duty we placed upon them four years ago. Here is this paragraph about perfumery. Four years ago we increased the duty on perfumeries. The gentleman comes in now and not only adopts our increase, but he goes us one better and increases the duty that we put on perfumery four years ago. It is a little blind and covered up, but it is here all the same. I refer to page 47 of the handbook. We had a duty of 60 cents per pound and 50 per cent where the perfumery contained alcohol. Here is a duty of 40 cents per pound and 60 per cent where they contain alcohol. The ad valorem duty on our bill on the importations of 1910 was 71.17; 1912, 72.8, and on his 74.29, not only equal to our duty but more duty than we put on it. I simply want to call the attention of my friend to this, and he has put that on perfumeries contained in this paragraph 49. They have increased the duty, except on Florida water, which I believe they have left at the same rate of 20 per cent. And as we go along I may call attention to others all the way through the bill that where we increased in many instances he adopted the increases. Now, I am going to justify him. It is more sensible than a good many things he put in the bill where he reduced the duty. We increased the rates on things which were luxuries, like perfumery, and he followed our example. On things like wine and spirits and jewelry and a number of other items, I will call his attention to and show what is in his bill, because he did not seem to know this morning and was rather indignant that I should make such an imputation upon his bill. I do not criticize him for it; I rather commend him, and if he had only followed more of the rates in the present bill he would not have half as much trouble on his mind as he is having now about the future of the law if he gets it on the statute books.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me the question this morning, and I asked him to point out where the increases he made over the Dingley bill were adopted by this committee and where in some instances we recognized the fact and even increased the Payne rate; but I desire him to point out this, and I am glad that he points it out now. I made this statement in reference to this very article in my opening speech

when this bill came before the House—that we had increased luxuries and untaxed necessities, and I think the first item I called his attention to where we had increased the Payne rate was this very perfumery item to which the gentleman refers now. Now, on luxuries such as perfumeries we are proud to say we not only keep the gentleman's increases, but we went him one better and put the rate even higher; and on the tax on alcohol we accepted the increase which he made and recognized it was a revenue tax and a proper place to levy taxes. What I wanted to point out was where we had followed his increases or increased the rate that it was either on alcohol or it was on an absolute luxury of the rich, and we did not follow him when he increased the rate on cotton goods and other necessities of the poor. We not only decreased his rates but we put them below what the Dingley bill was and in some instances what the Wilson bill was.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

52. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, 15 per cent ad valorem; manufactured, 20 per cent ad valorem; blanc-fixe, or artificial sulphate of barytes, and satin white, or artificial sulphate of lime, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of this measure what reduction is made on barytes, the crude and manufactured article?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Tennessee will find that by consulting the handbook that the reduction on crude barytes is from the ad valorem equivalent of 77 per cent to 15 per cent. The reduction upon the manufactured article is from 65 per cent to 20 per cent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, something has been said in the discussion of this tariff bill in general debate that it is a sectional bill, and criticism has been directed to the fact that southern Members on the Ways and Means Committee have taken care of the South in the preparation of this bill. I am a southern Representative on the floor of the House and a Republican, and I wish to state that that charge is not well founded. There are 7 men on the Committee on Ways and Means from the Southern States, counting Missouri as a Southern State, of the 14 Democrats, and I want to say in justice to them that they have not, in the preparation of this bill, discriminated in favor of the South as against the North, East, and West. Take, for instance, the State of Alabama. Its coal is placed on the free list; iron ore on the free list; bauxite on the free list, out of which they manufacture aluminum; lumber is on the free list; steel rails on the free list; pig iron reduced from \$2.50 to 80 cents and \$1.25 a ton; and cotton goods and hosiery reduced to such an extent that the American Manufacturers' Association of the South, representing more than 850 mills, with an invested capital of \$300,000,000 and the employment of over 200,000 operators, have stated that the operation of this bill will virtually impair, if not destroy, the manufacture of cotton goods in the South.

The State of Arkansas produces zinc and lead and bauxite and lumber. Zinc is virtually placed on the free list in this bill, which will prevent the further development of that industry in Arkansas, but will revive the industry in zinc and lead in the Republic of Mexico. Bauxite is placed on the free list, and that raw material is only found in the United States in Arkansas, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee. Lumber, produced in Arkansas, is placed on the free list.

Now we come to the State of Florida. The Members from that State can testify what effect this bill will have on the citrus fruit and lumber industries of that Commonwealth. When we reach the State of Georgia iron ore, bauxite, and lumber are on the free list and cotton goods and hosiery reduced, when we are already importing \$65,000,000 worth of cotton goods made in foreign mills. Kentucky suffers because coal is on the free list and her lumber on the free list. Louisiana's sugar industry, according to the admission of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] last night, is to be destroyed at the end of three years, an industry in which more than \$100,000,000 of her citizens is locked up in sugar plants and half of her inhabitants affected directly or indirectly by the industry.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I have not time in the five minutes.

Not only sugar, but there is lumber in Louisiana which is placed on the free list.

Mississippi's lumber goes on the free list.

Well, take North Carolina; the duty on her cotton goods and mica reduced and her lumber and paper placed on the free list. Take South Carolina, with magnificent cotton mills scattered

all over that State, the duties reduced to such an extent that practically every cotton mill in South Carolina is entering a protest and sending a letter of protest to the Democratic caucus here stating that if this bill becomes a law it will destroy or greatly injure this great industry of the State. Oklahoma, broom corn and coal on the free list and gypsum about free. Take Texas, and her wool is on the free list, meat on the free list, and her iron ore on the free list. Tennessee with coal on the free list, iron ore on the free list, bauxite on the free list, zinc and barytes virtually on the free list, lumber on the free list, pig iron reduced from \$2.50 to 80 cents and \$1.25, and her cotton goods and hosiery industry stabbed to the very heart. Virginia has her coal and lumber placed on the free list, the pig-iron duty greatly reduced, zinc and cattle practically on the free list.

I repudiate the statement that the southern members of the Ways and Means Committees have drawn this bill on sectional lines and in the interests of the South. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

54. Black pigments, made from bone, ivory, or vegetable substance, by whatever name known; gas black and lampblack, dry or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I intended to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] a while ago in reference to olive oil, in paragraph 46. It says:

Olive oil not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; olive oil, in bottles, etc., 30 cents per gallon.

I recall that under the existing law the rate is fixed per gallon in each case. Is the olive oil not provided for intended to cover olive oil in bulk?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is intended to cover the denatured olive oil, which is on the free list.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. Denatured olive oil is on the free list. On page 10, lines 19 and 20, it says:

Olive oil not specially provided for in this section.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman is correct, and it also covers the denatured olive oil, which is on the free list.

Mr. MANN. Is that 20 per cent ad valorem to cover olive oil in bulk?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now, on the theory of making that rate an ad valorem rate and making the rate on olive oil in packages a specific rate, is that intentional or did you intend to have that?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That was correct; that was intentional. The specific tax is just about the same ad valorem equivalent as the ad valorem itself.

Mr. MANN. I understand it runs at the rate of about a dollar a gallon?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentleman would say that in the operation of the price of olive oil, making an ad valorem rate on one method of bringing it in and a specific rate on the other, it might absolutely cut out one or the other and give a great preferential to some particular importer or an exporter.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Taking it along in a great number of years it seems to run about the same ad valorem equivalent. The question of trade-mark and label enter very largely into these matters, anyway.

Mr. MANN. If it runs about the same, why did not the gentleman fix it specific in both cases, or else ad valorem in both cases?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman wherever it is possible I am in favor of putting ad valorem taxes in the bill, but it is very difficult indeed to apply ad valorem rates to these importations of olive oil in bottles, jars, kegs, and other packages, because it may require you to go back to some village in Italy and find out what the market price is there. It is much easier to find in dealing with large imports in bulk with an ad valorem rate.

Mr. MANN. I suppose olive oil coming in is of the same value, so far as the export is concerned, whether it is in one form or another, unless you put the rate on the packages themselves.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is very much more difficult to trace these imports of bottles of olive oil in the small villages where they may have bottled them than to trace the large bulk importations, which can be very easily traced and on which there is a certain market price.

Mr. MANN. If olive oil should go up in price, it would practically result in all the olive oil being brought in in these packages?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think it would be regulated in that way; yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether that is desirable or not. The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in the manufacture of which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are used, in pulp, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask my colleague, Mr. HARRISON, whether, in fixing these duties on lead paints and paints made from lead, he took into consideration the fact that in making lead into paint the weight is largely increased?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Well, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] knows, a large proportion of the cost of manufacturing lead paints is the cost of the lead itself. In the case of white lead, I believe, it amounts to over 90 per cent; but, although I think our margin was a little bit close in our last year's bill between the tax on lead and the tax on lead paints, still I think that situation has been improved in this year's bill by a further reduction in our proposed duties upon the lead itself. I think this provides a pretty satisfactory arrangement of that situation.

Mr. PAYNE. Both of them are taxed by weight, are they not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, the conversion of lead into paint increases largely the duty automatically?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not now know the exact proportion. I have not thought of that for about four years. It looks to me as though the gentleman had an undue proportion of duty on lead paints in comparison with his duty on lead, but I am not particular about it. I am only making a suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lead, acetate of, white, and nitrate of, 1½ cents per pound; acetate of, brown, gray, or yellow, 1 cent per pound; all other lead compounds not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, a great many Members on the floor are using this report, and I wish therefore to ask that the Clerk be directed to read the paragraph numbers also.

Mr. MANN. They are a part of the bill, and the Clerk ought to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the numbers.

The Clerk read as follows:

65. Potash: Bicarbonate of, refined, ½ cent per pound; chlorate of, chromate and bichromate of, 1 cent per pound; cyanide of, 1½ cents per pound; nitrate of, or saltpeter, refined, \$7 per ton; permanganate of, 1 cent per pound; prussiate of, red, 2 cents per pound; yellow, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 25, after the word "yellow," strike out the numerals "1½" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "2."

Mr. MOORE. This is a proposition, Mr. Chairman, to increase the rate from 1½ cents per pound on yellow prussiate of potash to 2 cents a pound. There is an intense competition in this commodity and there is a struggle on the part of those engaged in the industry in this country to maintain it. I am informed that the difference in the wage cost is as the difference between an average of \$2.25 per day to the wage earner in the United States and 3 marks or 75 cents a day to the wage earner doing corresponding work in Germany. It is believed that the one and a quarter cents duty proposed in this bill is not sufficient to enable the industry to thrive properly in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE. I do. I am through. I merely wanted to make a plain statement of the situation.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to reduce the duty on yellow prussiate of potash from 4 cents a pound to 1½ cents a pound.

This article is used in making colors, in textiles, and has a very large consumption in other manufacturing processes. The testimony before the Senate Finance Committee last year indicated that under the existing duty, which is over 40 per cent ad valorem, the American makers of yellow prussiate of potash were gradually going out of business; that of the seven firms that formerly made it here only three survive to-day.

It is true that a large part of our consumption of this article is imported, perhaps over 50 per cent, but the reason for that is not, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] stated, because of the difference in wages here and in Germany. It is because the American manufacturers of yellow prussiate of potash are using an obsolete method of manufacture. They make it here now in the way it used to be manufactured in Europe, out of old leather scraps, horn, old shoes, and so on, and carbonate of potash. In Germany they now make it out of coal gas, a very much cheaper and simpler process, and there is no justification for a rate of duty which will equalize an inefficient and obsolete method of manufacture in the United States with the foreign production cost.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. It is true that there were seven establishments manufacturing this yellow prussiate of potash a few years ago, and that there are only three now—one in Philadelphia, one in Syracuse, and one in Cincinnati. The gentleman is so advised, is he not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And is it not true also that in endeavoring to maintain these establishments there is the difference in wages substantially as I stated a moment ago?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I do not admit the gentleman's contention that that is what causes the cheaper cost of production abroad. I maintain, on the contrary, that it is the newer and cheaper process they have adopted.

Mr. MOORE. I understand the gentleman's argument is that because antiquated machinery or antiquated methods are used in the United States, therefore the men engaged in the business here should not continue in business in the manner in which they are now doing business; but the gentleman does not deny that in doing business as they do do it, whether efficiently or otherwise, in the gentleman's opinion, they still have to meet this difference in labor cost between \$2.25 and 75 cents a day?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman and I can not agree as to the bearing that has upon the argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I regard the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] as one of the ablest Members of this or any other body of men. [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Bust! [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. There is no "bust" about that statement. A year ago the gentleman from New York drew a chemical-schedule bill which was presented to the House. As he stated at the time, he had some assistance from experts, and I think did some very able work in regard to the bill, as tariff bills go. As no one else on our side of the House seemed likely to give any special attention to the chemical schedule at that time, I undertook to make some investigation myself, hurriedly, without expert advice in the main, and when the bill was presented to the House I offered a series of amendments to it. Of course the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] in charge of the bill resisted all of the amendments, as I suppose it was his duty to do, acting as he was practically under caucus direction. Among those amendments I offered were some which were to items carried in this paragraph.

There was refined carbonate of potash, there was caustic or hydrate of potash, there was crude nitrate of potash or saltpeter. They were all then on the free list.

They were all on the free list, and I proposed to restore them to the free list, and the gentleman declined to accept the amendment. They were rejected, but, in the light of information subsequently received, the gentleman has put them all back on the free list in this bill.

The same is true of a large number of other amendments which I offered at that time. They are incorporated in this bill, having been rejected a year ago. I call attention to this solely for the purpose of showing the necessity of some one who will obtain accurate information in advance, in order to assist the committee which makes up the tariff bill. The gentleman from New York, a distinguished and able man, drew the bill a year ago, and upon the suggestion, in the House here under debate, that many of the items were incorrectly placed in the bill he made a further study and incorporated in this bill the most of the amendments which I offered a year ago. What would be the case if he had accurate, trustworthy, specific information acquired by a nonpartisan or partisan commission? Doubtless many of the items which escaped my attention a year ago, and therefore have escaped the attention of my distinguished friend from New York, would either be taken out of the dutiable list

and put on the free list or, perhaps, taken out of the free list and put on the dutiable list in this bill.

No one Member of the House, in my judgment, knows more thoroughly the schedules in this tariff, perhaps, than did the gentleman from New York, and yet the gentleman from New York now, after having received some suggestions and advice from a nonexpert, has acquired a vast fund of information, which has caused him to make many changes in this bill; and the most of the changes, I am frank to say, in my judgment, greatly improve the character of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this has been a field day on the question of a tariff board or a tariff commission. It is not my purpose to tax the patience of the House with any extended remarks. I think it has been a valuable day, for it has revealed the attitude of the Democrats on the subject.

The statement made by the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as to the doctrine of himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, shows that they are in favor of a tariff board or commission, but that it must be a partisan board. The Republican position on that subject has been from the start that it must be a nonpartisan board or commission. The gentleman from Missouri says that there is no such thing as a nonpartisan board on great industrial questions of this kind. I do not agree with him. I believe we had a nonpartisan tariff board that gathered the facts of the wool industry and of the cotton industry. Although they were selected from different parties, as the law required them to be, that board was unanimous in its reports.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not that kind of board a bipartisan board instead of a nonpartisan board?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is a mere quibble of words. You can call it a bipartisan board; it was not a partisan board.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do they always constitute the board with an odd number of members?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I suppose so that the majority may rule if it comes to a disagreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly; and it is always your majority.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. But the work of that committee or board was unanimously reported upon. You can call it a bipartisan or a nonpartisan board.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; a nonpartisan board would be a board that had no politics, and I do not believe there are five men in the United States that have sense enough to know anything about the tariff that have no politics. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The purpose of a commission or a board of that kind is to pass upon the facts, and we may find men broad enough, although they may have convictions of a partisan kind, and a knowledge as to where these facts would lead in the making up of schedules, yet they are not charged with the responsibility of making the schedules, but with the responsibility of gathering the facts in regard to industries and reporting upon them, and I undertake to say that it is not difficult at all to find men of sufficient breadth, no matter what political views they may have, to make a nonpartisan report upon those facts. I undertake to say that the work done by the last tariff board was of that character, and although they were appointed from different parties, they agreed unanimously on all the facts involved. That is what this House needs, that is what the country needs in approaching a revision of the tariff. It is not a report that is colored by the partisanship of men, but a report on essential facts so plainly found, so nonpartisan in its character, that any political party acting on these facts may know they have the truth of the facts involved. Then it is for the party to apply its own theory in the shaping of the different schedules, based upon those facts.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. A great deal has been said here to-day about a tariff board and a tariff commission. One wing of the Republican Party demands a tariff board and the other wing demands a tariff commission. We have had some amusing things here to-day. The falling out of these remnants of the old party has brought some very interesting and amusing things to light. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] has brought into question the sincerity of the leaders of the old Republican Party. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has undertaken to prove that they were sincere by Democrats. This he has failed utterly to do, and I do not see why he should bring these matters in question here since those leaders have gone

from this floor. This is a new day, and the people are once more in control. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder you demand a tariff board or a tariff commission. The interests back of you have always demanded that power be placed in the hands of the smallest number of men possible, for it would be easier for them to influence a board of 5 members or a commission of 5 members than it would be to influence a House of Representatives of over 400 men coming up from all sections of the country. They favor a tariff board or a tariff commission and, in my judgment, the American people will never submit to a tariff board or a tariff commission, which is one and the same thing, the insurgents favoring one and stand-patters favoring the other. The difference is that between tweedledum and tweedledee. A tariff board? Oh, no. A tariff commission? Oh, yes. There stands the leader from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] on this side demanding a commission and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] demanding a board.

Why can not we get information before the Committee on Ways and Means? That committee can have expert men and does have expert men before it. Why can we not give them money to employ experts—competent men to get up important facts and bring to the committee? They can get evidence from every nook and corner of the earth and they do it; but, gentlemen, you never can explain to the American people why you have written the most obnoxious bill ever put on the statute book without the aid of a commission, without the aid of a board, and when you were raising the tax rates you did not need a board and you spurned the assistance of a commission, but when we come to lower the tax rate you say, Give us a board or give us a commission. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in reply to our friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], I want to say that I do not see that he follows his own logic. He tells us that the reason the Republicans are favoring a tariff commission is that they want to get the control and regulation of the tariff in the hands of the fewest people so that they can be reached by the interests. In other words, he discredits five men or six men but is willing to trust a larger number of men. He wants to trust 435 men who are on this floor to-day, or who ought to be here representing the people of this country; but the system that his party has adopted has reduced the 435 men to 146 men, a bare majority of the Democratic membership of this House. One hundred and forty-six men, by reason of the binding effect of the secret caucus, are absolutely controlling the vote of the 290 Democratic Members of this House, and by this means a minority of the Members of this House are actually thwarting the will of the majority, and the remainder of this House are gagged and bound, tied hand and foot. Will the gentleman follow his own logic and will he give the remainder of us a chance to engage and take part in this tariff discussion and in this tariff making?

Could a more unreasonable or unjust policy have been adopted? Has not public opinion of late demanded that the tariff making be separated from partisan politics and that the tariff in the future be based upon a knowledge of the facts and not upon partisan interest?

But from the very beginning of this Congress every Member has been driven by the majority of the Democratic caucus into a position where he has to support this bill in its entirety or be deprived of taking any effective part in framing this bill. He is not permitted to vote for those schedules he is in favor of or to vote against those he is opposed to. He must vote for all or against all. One hundred and forty-six men have assumed control of this House, and they are going to maintain it at all costs. Gentlemen, go on and maintain it, but there is a future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have heard a great deal about the confusion between the name "tariff board" and "tariff commission." It means nothing more than a confusion. Some people prefer the one name, others prefer the other name, and it does not offer any argument against the tariff commission or the tariff board. If there is any reason for a tariff commission, there would be the same reason for a tariff board, for they are both designed to get information that we need, and I can not understand why anyone would stir up the dust or confuse the meaning when a great principle is at stake, simply because of a quibble of terms. In this day, the day of efficiency, the day of economy, when we are trying to ascertain the facts in every case, the time of commissions, when we are using this method of securing definite and expert knowledge more than ever before, we hear upon this floor utterances against this method of securing information. It would seem to me that we should not seek information upon the tariff from the standpoint of politics. I say, gentlemen, it is little short of a crime to the business of this country at every

periodic time to be hung up, not able to know how to make their contracts to be fulfilled within the next six months or a year. Tariff legislation can never be constant; tariff revision from time to time is absolutely necessary. If you make a tariff bill to-day you have got to make a different one in five or ten years from now. It is not the fault of the bill. It is because the business of the country develops under different conditions, and consequently rates must be changed. Now, I ask why not have a nonpartisan board—a commission, if you please, that will be nonpartisan—to get the information, not to recommend rates but to give information, not as a political body, as this Ways and Means Committee must always be political. From the very character of the organization of this House the Ways and Means Committee must be political. This is what we wish to avoid by a commission.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield? I just want to ask him the question how he would secure a nonpartisan tariff commission?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman must make a distinction between political individuality and a political board. I can be on a board and retain my politics, but my politics does not need to go into the board. You can have a nonpartisan board composed of men every one of whom still has his political views on other matters. Do you say the Supreme Court is partisan? Is the Interstate Commerce Commission partisan? Is the Industrial Commission partisan? Is the educational system of our States and Nation partisan? Who appointed Mr. Claxton, a friend of mine, the great representative of the Southern States, as the head of the educational movement of this country? It was William Howard Taft, a Republican, who appointed a Democrat from the Southern States. Do you say that is partisan? Who chose the Supreme Justice of the United States, the Hon. Mr. White of Louisiana? Our late President chose him. Do you say that is partisan? You can have a board made up every man with his own political views, but the board is not political. You must make a difference between political activity individually and a political board. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. My time is about gone.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman remember what happened when the Tilden election case came before the Justices of the Supreme Court?

Mr. FESS. I will say to the gentleman from New York this matter came before an electoral commission, upon a subject that was political, growing out of an election dispute. Had it not been that the Democrats made three specific blunders they would never have had the situation that came. Who was it that was responsible for the electoral commission? It was Allen G. Thurman, of my State, who favored it, while Roscoe Conkling and James G. Blaine opposed the commission. If you are not satisfied with the results, blame the Democrats and not the Republicans. [Applause on the Republican side.] This tariff commission should be established upon the basis of a nonpartisan character, and then when a schedule needs modification change it, but do not attempt such change in a political campaign, a campaign which unsettles business by hanging it to the contingency of the results of an election. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 577. An act authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit.

THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

67. Soaps: Perfumed toilet soaps, 40 per cent ad valorem; medicinal soaps, 30 per cent ad valorem; castile soap and unperfumed toilet soap, 10 per cent ad valorem; all other soaps not specially provided for in this section, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 4, after the word "soaps," strike out "40" and insert in lieu thereof "50."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of correcting what seems to be an error in the policy of the majority in taxing luxuries. Perfumed soap is unquestionably a luxury, as it comes in from abroad. The French soaps and English soaps are sought principally by those whose toilets and boudoirs are of such a nature as do not provoke the enthusiasm of the downtrodden workingman.

Under the Payne law perfumed soaps, which the Republicans rated as luxuries and not necessities, were taxed at the rate of 50 per cent. Under the Underwood bill the duty has been reduced to 40 per cent in order that the rich, not the poor, may obtain these French soaps at 10 per cent ad valorem cheaper than they did under the Republican system.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In answer to the facetious remarks of my friend from Pennsylvania, I will call his attention to the fact that we estimated by making this reduction in rates from 50 to 40 per cent we would stimulate imports and collect more revenues.

Mr. MOORE. On luxuries?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I think the rate of 50 per cent is higher than the best revenue point.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield a little further?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did I understand the gentleman to say he expected to collect more revenue?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Those are the committee estimates.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then you are a little more fortunate than you have been in other places in the figures you have placed in this handbook, because we estimate a lower rate.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The estimates I have before me are \$162,000 and increased to \$174,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not the one I have here. It is \$162,000 to be reduced to \$150,000.

Mr. MOORE. A dead loss of \$12,000 in the revenue by reducing the rate so that the rich may obtain this perfumed soap lower than they did last year.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what figures the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] may have. He says he refers to the committee estimates. Are those different from the figures which were submitted with the report?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. From what the gentleman from Iowa says, evidently it is true. The estimates which I hold in my hand, contained in the revised caucus print of last year, are the figures upon which the committee did its voting, and in these estimates there is an increase of revenues expected, as I indicated.

Mr. MANN. When was this document made up, pray? This is the report of the committee to the House.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That was made subsequent to the time this was made.

Mr. MANN. Then does not the gentleman think, after ascertaining that the information which he has before him is incorrect and that the information here is supposedly later and correct, that he ought to change his attitude upon the bill? He gave as his reason for making the reduction that it would increase the revenue, whereas the estimate contained in the report made by the committee is that the amount now collected under the present rate of 50 per cent is \$162,255 for the year 1912, and the amount that will be collected under the bill as the rate has been reduced is \$150,000, or \$12,255 less than the amount actually collected last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will, of course, realize that estimates of revenues are purely a matter of judgment. Nobody can make an affidavit as to what the revenues will be or will not be. But my own judgment is, as the figures of our revised caucus print show, that this rate will stimulate imports and raise more revenue.

Mr. MANN. But do I understand that the gentleman in preparing this bill obtained these figures and then did not look at them?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that so far as my vote was concerned, it was based on these figures, and that if there is any discrepancy between them and the figures the gentleman holds in his hand, I shall stand on these.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says these were the figures we had last year.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Those figures were prepared this year, in February.

Mr. MANN. But these figures were prepared by the committee and submitted in its report to the House. The gentleman

must have had these figures before him when he prepared his bill. The caucus must have had these figures before it when it passed upon the bill. It is one of those things that the gentleman does not seem to be able to explain, and I am sure no one else can.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, the printed figures submitted in this report a few days ago are the only figures we have to guide us. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] how these figures were prepared, as presented by the committee in its report?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. They were prepared by the clerks of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman wish to discredit them?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman that the probability is that the gentleman wishes to discredit me. That is more like it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would suggest that if the gentleman can not discredit the figures here, he had better give us a better reason for the committee provision.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. When the committee acted, it acted upon its best judgment and information in the matter. In making estimates no human being can arrive at perfectly accurate figures. No human being can do that. This is only an estimate.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman says that this estimate was the controlling motive in making the change contained in this provision from the rate fixed in the present law. If their estimates on which they base their action are not correct, we had better return to the old law and the old rate.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. I rise to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman rises in his own right.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] hurriedly, did not recall the real reason for this reduction. The gentleman from New York is something of a free trader. He has not reduced—and I say "he" advisedly, for I understand that in the case of this chemical schedule he is the agent for all you gentlemen on that side—he did not reduce the rates on the raw material of perfumed soaps. They remain the same. How can you fix American industries to suit a free-trade Democrat better than by maintaining the present rates on the raw material, or in raising them, and reducing the duty on the finished products? It is entirely logical from the gentleman's standpoint. Heaven knows that American industries will ordinarily suffer enough if we reduce the rates all along the line and place them in unprotected competition with the balance of the world; but if you want to trim them up in a way to be particularly pleasing to a free-trade Democrat, the thing to do is to do as they have done in this case—retain the duty on the oil which is used for the manufacture of the soap, retain the duty on the perfume used in its manufacture, or increase it a little, and then put the American producer of the finished article out of business by reducing the rate on the finished product. While the gentleman from Kentucky appeals for the farmer, there are a few perfumed dandies who must be taken care of by this Democratic tariff bill, and so we are pleasing both the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York in this matter and adjusting it so as to arrange that we shall not only pay about what we now pay for toilet soaps, but make sure that they are all going to be made abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

71. Vanillin, 10 cents per ounce; vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound; tonka beans, 25 cents per pound.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question.

A gentleman came into my office the other day and said he was interested in the manufacture of vanillin, which he said was made out of cloves. He stated that you have reduced the duty on vanillin under this bill from 20 cents an ounce to 10 cents an ounce, and that in the meantime you have imposed a duty on cloves. Cloves, his raw material, have been transferred from the free list to the dutiable list at 2 cents an ounce. Was that a correct statement?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts has correctly stated the tax proposed upon cloves, but is in error in supposing that vanillin is made solely from oil of cloves. Vanillin is and was formerly made chiefly from oil of cloves, but is now made to an increasing extent from coal-tar derivatives. And it is not at all improbable that this will entirely drive the other process out of the market.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman may be correct about that, but I am not sure that he is correct. I find on looking it up that vanillin was formerly made from vanilla, and that later on it was made from oil of cloves, and such is the case to-day. Vanillin is also made sometimes from coniferin, which, as the gentleman knows, is the sap of coniferous trees. I understand that this industry is of importance, and that in the State of New Jersey it employs a large number of men.

Now, is it just, from the point of view of the gentleman, to reduce the duty on vanillin down to 10 cents per ounce simultaneously with an imposition of a duty on cloves? The gentleman is aware, perhaps, that in the Dingley bill the duty on vanillin was 80 cents per ounce. The Payne bill reduced the duty to 20 cents per ounce, and now you have reduced it to 10 cents per ounce.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman from Massachusetts, while stating the figures correctly, does not call the attention of the committee to the very great ad valorem equivalent of those figures. Under the Dingley tariff 80 cents an ounce amounted to 251 per cent. The Payne law reduced it to 20 cents an ounce, which is nearly 90 per cent ad valorem, and our tax of 10 cents an ounce is an ad valorem equivalent of nearly 48 per cent, which still leaves a very generous manufacturing margin between the finished product and the oil of cloves.

Mr. GARDNER. I should not so much doubt the wisdom of reducing the duty if that were the whole question. I admit those high equivalent ad valorem. I do not, however, think the gentleman ought at the same time to put a tax on cloves, unless he thinks that they are a luxury. Now, when I have had occasion, as has happened once in awhile, to take a single clove, I have never supposed that I was indulging in a luxury. I doubt if the gentleman is correct in supposing that cloves are luxuries.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman no doubt refers to the return homeward in the evening. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. I do.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, after the word "pound," insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That none of the articles specified in this schedule shall be admitted to the United States until it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign labor employed in the manufacture thereof shall have been paid wages equal to wages paid for similar labor in the United States, and that such foreign labor has not been employed thereon exceeding 8 hours per day."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to that.

Mr. MOORE. I think the amendment is clearly in order. I offer the amendment for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the House the advisability, if we are to introduce foreign goods into the United States, of imposing the American wage scale and the American limitation as to hours of employment upon the competitor on the other side. In other words, inasmuch as the 8-hour law is in force in the United States and has continually been upheld by this House in all legislation, and as that is the limit of time for labor of the United States, that labor should not be put in competition with goods made by men in any foreign country who work more than 8 hours a day.

It is a matter of fact that can not be contradicted that in certain countries like England and Germany, where labor unions are supposed to be strong and vigorous, that the wages are lower than in the United States and the hours of labor longer. It is perfectly well known that in Italy and Spain and other southern European countries where competition with American labor exists, that they labor on through the night and for wages that are intolerable from our viewpoint. We are now entering on a policy which proposes that we shall give cheap goods to the people of the United States, thus reducing the opportunity for the employment of labor in the United States, and we should at least impose some restrictions on the foreign labor employed on cheap goods that are to drive the American laborer out of employment and reduce the American wage.

I submit that the amendment is in order. It is a limitation upon the schedule in the bill and is entirely germane. It is at least a humane amendment, which ought to be adopted by those who want to reduce the hours of labor and increase the wage

of the workman and do not want him subjected to unfair and unjust foreign competition.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago when in Japan I went into a woolen mill at Osaka. It contained German up-to-date machinery as fine as any in the United States. While walking through the factory I asked the superintendent how long the employees worked and what wages they were paid, and he replied, "We pay the men 44 sen and the women 40 sen a day." That was equivalent, respectively, to 22 cents and 20 cents a day of our money. Up-to-date machinery, free Australian wool, and expert operatives working 11 hours a day for 20 and 22 cents a day.

Does it do any good to exclude the Japanese workingman if he can stay at home and send his product here to compete with labor using similar machinery and receiving \$2 or more a day and working 8 hours a day? That is this tariff question. If the competitors were just across the Potomac River here in Virginia everybody on this floor would see the true issue in its real significance. But the fact that the competition comes from across the Pacific or the Atlantic Ocean does not in these days of cheap transportation by great ocean freighters make the tariff any less a problem of tremendous importance to the industries of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from New York what vanillin is; what it is used for?

Mr. GARDNER. It is a flavoring extract.

Mr. COOPER. I noticed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] said that it is being made also from coal-tar derivatives. Is there any question as to whether it is possible to make entirely healthful edibles from coal tar?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know; I did not know the fact until the gentleman from New York spoke. I have read that it was made of coniferin.

Mr. COOPER. What does the gentleman from Illinois know about that?

Mr. MANN. This is one of the so-called synthetic productions from coal tar that are entirely healthful. There are a large number of them made in Germany now. They are getting so they make every kind of flavoring extract from coal tar.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to know that, but the explanation given by the gentleman from New York is entirely new to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's argument I wish to say that the rates in this schedule are about 20 per cent, or a little less. The Payne rates are a little less than 26 per cent. There is no very great reduction as a whole in this schedule, and the present rates, as fixed in Schedule A, more than equalize the difference in labor cost at home and abroad. There can be no question about that, placing them on the average.

As to the protection of labor, there is but one way that you can really protect labor, and that is to protect it in the home market by not allowing an oversupply of labor. Some of us have been in favor of reasonable restriction of labor coming in in competition against American labor. Until you do that there is no use of talking about protecting labor from competition abroad through tariff rates when you leave the sluice gates wide open for European labor to come in to compete with our own.

Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order. I think there can be no question about this coming within the rules. It must be germane to the paragraph and germane to the section. If this were introduced as an original proposition, it would not go to the Committee on Ways and Means, and there is no question about a limitation. There might be a question of the matter being germane as a limitation to an appropriation, but there is no question of a limitation to a revenue bill whatever. Therefore I think it is clearly out of order and is not germane to the paragraph or to the section.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose is to get a vote or expression of sentiment on this general question, and to bring it in at the close of some schedule where it will be given a test so that it can be determined whether we want to restrict the goods that come in, so far as the labor employed on them is concerned. If this is not germane to the schedule, and it reads "all goods referred to in this schedule," then I can not see where it can come in as an original matter at all. The bill provides for certain imports into the United States. It is surely within the province of the House to say how those goods shall come and what kind of goods they shall be. That is stated in every paragraph of the schedule thus far read, and to say that the goods so admitted into the United States shall not be made by men who work more than eight hours a day or shall not be made by men who work at a wage lower than the American wage, is clearly within the power of the House. Let the Chair

consider what has been done from time to time in the matter of the Army and Navy appropriation bills, and in the matters of riders upon the regular appropriation bills. I am sure it will be difficult for him to distinguish between the limitations there set out and the limitations here proposed. This limitation has a direct reference to the goods that shall be admitted under the tariff bill. What kind of goods shall come in under this bill? The bill says, for instance:

Talcum, ground talc, steatite, and French chalk, cut, powdered, washed, or pulverized, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The kind of talcum is designated.

It also provides in another paragraph:

Salts and all other compounds and mixtures of which bismuth, gold, platinum, rhodium, silver, and tin constitute the element of chief value, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Has the House not a right to strike out bismuth and limit it to salts alone? And by the same token has not the House the right to say that the salt that shall come into the United States shall be salt dug out of the salt mines by men who do not work more than eight hours a day or who do not work for wages such as exist in foreign countries?

Mr. AUSTIN. And does not this bill itself prohibit the importation of convict-made goods?

Mr. MOORE. It does. There is a limitation in point, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing it to the attention of the Chair. I submit this matter and will endeavor to get it up in some way. I shall not appeal from the decision of the Chair if the Chair shall rule against me on the point of order. An effort will be made to have a determination of this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers the following amendment:

Page 17, line 5, after the word "pound," insert a colon and the following:

"Provided, That none of the articles specified in this schedule shall be admitted to the United States until it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign labor employed in the production or manufacture thereof shall have been paid wages equal to wages paid for similar labor in the United States, and that such foreign labor has not been employed thereon exceeding eight hours per day."

To this the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] makes the point of order that it is not germane.

The Chairman has hastily examined such precedents as he could find. Clause 3 of Rule XXI reads:

No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

It seems to the Chair that under that rule, especially when measured by the following precedent to which the Chair will call attention, the amendment is not now in order. The precedent is as follows:

On March 26, 1897, the tariff bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the Clerk had read the first paragraph as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of May, 1897, unless otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported from foreign countries or withdrawn for consumption, and mentioned in the schedules herein contained, the rates of duty which are by the schedules and paragraphs respectively prescribed, namely."

To this Mr. Alexander M. Dockery, of Missouri, proposed this amendment:

"Provided, That when it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that such articles are manufactured, controlled, or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, the importation of such articles from foreign countries shall be free of duty until such manufacture, control, or production shall have ceased, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. Nelson Dingley, of Maine, made a point of order against the amendment, and it was held by the Chairman, the late Vice President, Hon. James S. Sherman, that the amendment proposed was not germane. It seems to the Chair that is a case analogous to the one here. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out of lines 4 and 5 the words "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, by striking out of lines 4 and 5 the words "vanilla beans, 30 cents per pound."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should prevail I shall offer an amendment when the free list is reached, placing vanilla beans upon the free list, where they now are. There is a peculiar situation in this paragraph. Vanillin, which is a synthetic production of coal-tar products, is, in a way, in competition with the extract and other products from vanilla beans. Vanillin is not now imported to any great extent. A small amount only is imported. The present rate at 20 cents per ounce is to a large extent prohibitory as against vanilla

beans that come in free of duty. Now, what is the proposition in this bill? To reduce the rate on vanillin and put a duty on vanilla beans. Here is protection, not for American industries, but protection for German coal-tar industries. With vanillin at 10 cents an ounce and vanilla beans at 30 cents per pound, we will be importing large quantities of vanillin from Germany and drive out the importations of vanilla beans from North and South America. What is the theory of this? We sometimes have advocated a theory of protection to American industries, but I have not yet heard that anyone desired to put a high tariff on one product and a low one on another in order to encourage German industries at the expense of industries in some other part of the country. We are now importing \$2,000,000 worth of vanilla beans a year, and they are on the free list because they are raw material used in the manufacture of many products that enter into the making of vanilla extracts, and so forth. You propose to put a duty of 30 cents per pound on those, a very high rate of duty, and then cut in two by the duty on vanillin, which is a competitive article with vanilla beans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 42, yeas 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Alabama has privately indicated his intention to compel us to go ahead with this bill to-night. Practically it could only be done by unanimous consent and I am not disposed to object to reasonable progress. It is now nearly a quarter after 6 and we have finished the chemical schedule. Does not the gentleman want us to get a chance to eat a little, even if we do not take a drink?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, as far as this House is concerned we are responsible to the country for this bill, and if a quorum does not appear here I expect to send for one—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I understand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We are responsible, and our people ought to be here, and I want to try to keep them here. I appreciate the House has run on in good humor; we have tried to give gentlemen on that side the opportunity they desired, and they have not violated the privilege in any way.

If the gentleman desires now that a recess be taken, I am willing to accommodate him. I will take a recess until half past 7 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. That is the understanding. It can only be done in the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] to preside as Speaker pro tempore this evening.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 7.30 this evening.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 7.30 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

At 7.30 o'clock p. m., the recess having expired, Mr. GARNER, as Speaker pro tempore, called the House to order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties

and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE B—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE.

72. Fire brick, magnesite brick, chrome brick, and brick not specially provided for in this section, not glazed, enameled, painted, vitrified, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, 10 per cent ad valorem; if glazed, enameled, painted, vitrified, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, and bath brick, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Last year I noticed that the street car companies of Washington were laying on the street-car tracks a slag brick which was imported. May I ask the gentleman whether there is any provision in the bill in reference to a duty on those brick?

Mr. DIXON. They would come in under the heading of vitrified bricks.

Mr. MANN. I was told last year that these brick came here because they came in free of duty, although the language in the existing law in that respect is the same as in the pending bill.

Mr. DIXON. It is. It comes under section 480, under manufactures not otherwise specified, if it were not particularly mentioned.

Mr. MANN. They stated that it came in free. I talked with one of the District commissioners at the time, and made inquiry as to how it happened that they could import paying brick from Europe to pave the street-car tracks in the city of Washington, and I was told that there was no duty on that brick. It seems to me that if other brick are to have a duty imposed upon them it would be perfectly proper that this slag brick should have a duty upon them.

Mr. DIXON. I agree with the gentleman. My understanding is that they come in under vitrified brick.

Mr. MANN. I think that class of brick are carried in the existing law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know the class of brick to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has, no doubt, seen them piled up in the streets of Washington.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think I may have seen them, but I did not examine them, and if I had I do not think I would know them.

Mr. MANN. I was told they were a hard vitrified brick, made from ground slag in Belgium or somewhere else in Europe.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's informant must have been mistaken, because I know of no provision in the existing law which would allow such brick to come in free. If they would not fall in a classification that is fixed here, they would fall into the basket clause, and be subject to duty at some rate unless they were enumerated especially in the free list.

Mr. MANN. Whether they came in under the head of slag or not I do not know. Slag is made free under the existing bill. I do not know. But my informant was Commissioner Judson, who would undoubtedly know, and I am quite strongly of the impression that my recollection is correct that he said these brick were brought here because they came in free, and that the freight rate was probably less, coming by water to Washington, than it would be to ship brick from Pittsburgh or from anywhere in Indiana or any of the other places around here that furnish paving brick.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there must be some mistake, because they are clearly not slag, and I know of nothing in the existing law that would allow them to come in free.

Mr. MANN. I called the gentleman's attention to the matter so that he could look it up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Brick is not on the free list, and there is nothing in the existing law that would let them come in free. They are undoubtedly brick, and could not come in as anything else.

Mr. MANN. I think if brick are to be placed on the dutiable list at all that class of brick might well be on the dutiable list, either for revenue purposes, from the standpoint of the gentleman from Alabama, or for revenue and protection purposes, from our standpoint.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there must be some mistake about it.

Mr. DIXON. The circumstance that none of the brickmakers of the United States called the attention of the committee to that fact is an indication that nothing of that kind has come in free; otherwise they would have raised the point to the committee.

Mr. MANN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman will allow me, I inquired about this brick when I was in Pittsburgh and talked with some of the manufacturers there, and they told me the reason they did not manufacture them was because they came in free of duty, and they were unable to manufacture them in competition. I remember asking them about the bricks that were used here to pave the streets in the city of Washington, because it struck me as rather unusual and something of which we should not feel proud that we import brick here to pave the streets of the National Capital.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

73. Tiles, plain unglazed, one color, exceeding 2 square inches in size, 14 cents per square foot; glazed, ornamented, hand-painted, enameled, vitrified, semivitrified, decorated, encaustic, ceramic mosaic, flint, spar, embossed, gold decorated grooved and corrugated, and all other earthenware tiles and tiling, except pill tiles and so-called quarries or quarry tiles, 5 cents per square foot; so-called quarries or quarry tiles, 20 per cent ad valorem; mantels, friezes, and articles of every description or parts thereof, composed wholly or in chief value of earthenware tiles or tiling, except pill tiles, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 17, line 20, by inserting after the word "tiles" the following:

"But including tiles wholly or in part of cement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MANN. Do you want the word "but" in there?

Mr. DIXON. Yes. It will then read:

And all other earthenware, tiles and tiling, except pill tiles and so-called quarries or quarry tiles, but including tiles wholly or in part of cement, 5 cents per square foot.

That amendment is put in for the reason that there are being imported into the United States at this time some cement tiles, two-thirds of the tile being cement; but at the top there is a grinito marble that is being polished, and these tiles are coming in under another paragraph at a considerably lower rate. We thought they ought to be in the same paragraph with other tiles, because they are used for the same purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman what the increased importation of tiles under this schedule will amount to?

Mr. DIXON. From 108,000 square feet to 200,000 square feet.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in relation to the tiles paragraph I desire to introduce the following letter from the officers of the International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance protesting against the reduction of duties:

INTERNATIONAL BRICK, TILE, AND
TERRA COTTA WORKERS' ALLIANCE,
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1913.

Hon. J. H. MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our Trenton (N. J.) union of tile makers have called our attention to a proposition to reduce the duty on floor and wall tile which will be considered by the incoming Congress.

Should the present duty on floor and wall tile be reduced we very much doubt if anyone would benefit except importers or foreign manufacturers.

You are doubtless familiar with the comparative wage scales of the countries of Europe, therefore we will not burden you with tiresome statistics.

We would, however, call your attention to this fact: That the American tile presser and the kiln placer receive \$14.50 and \$15, respectively, while the Belgium worker receives \$3.92 and \$4.90 for the same labor. We would further call your attention to the fact that the wage earners of Spain and Italy in this line of work receive much less than those of Belgium.

Should the present rate on tile be reduced our American manufacturers and tile workers could not hope to meet the competition of the underpaid worker of Spain and Italy, who, we understand, works long hours and at a wage that would render any attempt at competition by the native ware hopeless.

In the struggle to meet the changed conditions, should the present protective tariff be lessened, it will inevitably happen that the smaller and weaker tile plants must succumb and be forced to the wall and the American worker deprived of the opportunity of earning his living at the trade that he has made his life's calling.

The American manufacturer and workman in the tile industry have done much to beautify the structures of our country. Even in the comparatively short period of 30 years that they have been in existence they have outstripped European competitors in the excellence of their material and in artistic expression and execution. Our American manufacturers have done much to develop and improve the art of tile making and even with the present protective tariff rate have not always received compensation in proportion to the results obtained.

Should the present rate be reduced the standard of the ware would of necessity become lower. In order to meet the changed conditions there would be a general reduction of wages, which are not even now sufficient, in some instances, to adequately maintain the American standard of living.

Trusting that you will give this, the protest of the tile workers, due consideration, we are,

Sincerely, yours,
[SEAL.]

FRANK BUTTERWORTH, *President.*
WM. VAN BODEGRAVEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

75. Lime, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 3, after the word "Lime," strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the Payne law the lime industry in my State was greatly injured, and it will be completely destroyed by this bill if it goes upon the statute books.

The lime industry of British Columbia is located upon Vancouver Island, so that they have the advantage of cheap water transportation not only into the markets of Washington but also of Oregon and California, which are the principal markets for the lime of Washington. The lime manufacturer of British Columbia employs Chinese labor. On our side—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask if the gentleman from Washington is addressing himself to line 3? My understanding is that the Clerk had only read line 2.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thought he had read line 3.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I undertook to rise at the end of line 2, and thought that was the last line that had been read by the Clerk, when the gentleman from Washington rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not object to going back if the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have no objection. I thought the Clerk had read line 3.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let us dispose of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington first, and then you can go back. I would not be willing to go back very far, but in this case it was a mistake.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It probably was a mistake. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

The lime manufacturer in the State of Washington employs white labor. The Chinamen receive \$1.75 per day. American labor receives \$2.87 a day.

The barrels in British Columbia cost 5 cents, and in the State of Washington 7 cents apiece. The wood for the burning of the lime in British Columbia costs \$1.40 to \$1.65 a cord, the Government furnishing timber to the lime producer at a low price. In the State of Washington they have to pay from \$2.50 to \$3.35 a cord.

The duty that British Columbia imposes upon our lime going into that country is 17½ per cent ad valorem, and they also charge the same rate upon the "package," as they term it, which is of equal value to the lime, so that in order to sell in the British Columbia market we have to pay 35 per cent ad valorem. It is proposed in this bill to reduce the duty we charge to 5 per cent ad valorem, while we have to pay to get into British Columbia 35 per cent. And it is not necessary for me to argue that it is impossible under this tariff for the American manufacturer to go into the British Columbia market. Not only that is prohibitive, but they have a law there that absolutely prohibits the American manufacturer from selling in British Columbia any article produced in this country for less than he sells it at home.

So that we are absolutely barred in the State of Washington from selling our lime there if we should happen to have an overproduction. Under the Payne law the greatest lime manufactory in the State of Washington has been running less than one-half of its capacity, while immediately across the line the large factory upon Vancouver Island has more than doubled its capacity. If the present duty is reduced, it means the end of the lime industry in that State. The industry is not very great. The industry, I believe, is estimated at a value of some \$13,000,000 last year, but it does employ American workingmen and it does pay American wages. Yesterday we heard a very eloquent address by a distinguished Democrat about our right and our duty upon the Pacific coast to exclude Japanese labor.

We have excluded the Chinese, but we have not excluded the result of that labor when it is brought into British Columbia. One-fourth of the men in British Columbia are orientals. When you reduce this tariff and drive the American lime manufacturer out of business, it is not going to reduce the cost of lime to any American citizen. If it was, we might perhaps view it with a little more complacency.

I received a day or two ago a letter which I wish I could make public, but it is a personal letter, written to me by a friend of mine of many years' standing, and in it he states that his entire fortune is invested in lime manufacturing. He said that if this bill went through, and he anticipated it would, he expected his business to be entirely destroyed, and in his old age he would have to go back to the practice of his profession. I appeal to the members of this committee. If there ever were any circumstances when we ought to have protection, it seems to me we ought to have it in this case. There is an absolute monopoly in British Columbia. They will not permit us to sell in their markets, and they produce their products by Chinese labor. We have heard the statement made by the President that we must go out and secure world markets. Will some gentleman on that side explain how it is possible for us to go into British Columbia markets when we let their products come in practically for nothing and they enact a prohibitive tariff against us?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman about the item of lime. I find in the handbook that since the Wilson law the duty on lime has been 5 cents per hundred pounds. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; but the gentleman will notice in the ad valorem that it has been reduced right along.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; that is true; and yet the quantity which we have imported seems to have constantly diminished. In 1896 we imported 428,000 pounds. In 1905, 261,000; in 1910 we imported 180,000 pounds; and in 1912 only 99,000 pounds. We seem to be taking pretty good care of ourselves under the present law in the matter of lime.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know what the situation is on the east coast. I am giving it on the west coast where we come into competition with this cheap oriental labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in reference to these two paragraphs, and I include the one before this because the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] indicates that he desires to offer an amendment to it, that this is really a freight-rate proposition; that when you get farther into the interior there can not be any competition, or even a short distance into the interior. It is a freight-rate proposition. The freight rate soon eats up the competition. The only reason we left a small rate was that the only competition there can be would be right on the border. It is a border proposition. I recognize that the gentleman from Washington is on the border, and there may be some undue competition in this particular item right at his place, but we can not afford to tax the people all over the United States to take care of one border proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The rate at present under the Payne law is only 9 per cent, and the gentleman from Washington not only wants double that but more than double that. His amendment would increase the rate to 25 per cent, which would make a tax on a very large number of people in order to protect the industry that happens to be located inadvantageously on the border at a particular point. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The duty against us is 35 per cent ad valorem, and even at 25 per cent it would be 10 per cent less than they levy against us.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it is 17½ per cent ad valorem in British Columbia on the lime and 17½ per cent on the package, and the package is of greater value than the lime, so it makes it 35 per cent ad valorem.

I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the further fact that in addition to having a water market they also have the advantage of foreign tramp ships, which they can get at a cheaper rate than we can to reach both Oregon and California. I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman from Alabama, that I do hope somewhere in this bill that he will see fit to make some provision in order that our manufacturers may be protected and our people be protected from the arbitrary action of British Columbia, not only in regard to these rates, but

in the matter to which I called attention a few moments ago, where we are absolutely prohibited from selling an article over there at less than here. I remember a man sold a logging engine, which was confiscated because it was below the regular rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman this bill has a clause in it that is similar to the dumping clause of Canada.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do hope the gentleman will work out something that will protect us.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What the gentleman is complaining of is the dumping clause of Canada, and this bill contains a dumping clause.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, when the subject was before the committee four years ago, we found—we knew it before—there was a very large lime business up at Rockland, Me. I have been at Rockland since and I have found the lime business there has increased largely by the putting in of more capital and the building of new mills, and I was told when I was there, as I learned before the committee, that the business was very much depressed at 5 cents a hundred pounds, the original duty they had there for many years. Now, it is hardly fair to say it is a local industry, because there they ship the lime to the American ports along the coast of New England and even as far as the city of New York. Of course, we have limekilns all over the United States, and I believe they are all over Canada. This was a complete business where they had gone into it on a large scale with a large investment of capital, and I kept the duty the same as it had been in the bill, although they asked for a much higher rate, and I think if the rate the gentleman put here is kept he will injure a very legitimate and large business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the rate the gentleman from New York has in the present bill is only a little bit over 9 per cent in ad valorem figures, whereas the rate that the gentleman from Washington proposes, if I understood his amendment that I heard read, was 25 per cent.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a very large increase. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 1, page 18, by striking out "5" and inserting "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 1, page 18, by striking out the figure "5" and inserting "20."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, this makes the rate 1.32 less than the present rate. Now, it may seem on first blush to many Members that this is a matter of very little importance to an industry far into the interior of the country. When you note that there are large importations of cement under the present rate of more than 20 per cent it is not difficult to see that a lesser rate would pay the freight farther into the interior. The trouble with the cement industry in my section of the country is that it is crowded from the best cities back into the interior and we are compelled to seek a market out into the intermountain country instead of on the seacoast and in the larger cities of the Mississippi Valley which are our natural market. The freight rate from Germany to St. Louis on cement is less than the freight rate from Chanute, Kans., to St. Louis on the same commodity. It comes in practically as ballast to the seaport, and the balance of the through rate, for some unaccountable reason, is always less than the rate from the interior to the coast of our country. The fear that I have is that this rate, being reduced from 21.32 per cent to 5, will have an injurious effect upon the industry and at the same time, as is estimated by the committee, reduce the revenues derived from the importation of cement.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to supplement what the gentleman says by adding that every cement plant in the United States is in bankruptcy now because they can not make cement at the price at which it is being sold.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was not anxious to advertise the fact that large cement industries, with millions invested, are having the greatest possible difficulty to keep out of the hands of a receiver, and, indeed, some of them are in the hands of receivers to-day, all because their best market has been taken away from them by the importation of the cheaper-made cement. And as a revenue measure I ask the committee if they will not agree to the present rate, or, at least, a rate of 1.32 per cent below the present rate? It will incidentally act as a protection to a very large industry that employs a very high grade of labor and a very large amount of capital in the interior of our country.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I can not understand why my colleagues on this side of the Chamber will continue to appeal to the majority of this House to write any protective features in this bill. The Democratic Party has declared, and its representatives upon the floor of this House and on the stump have declared, that protection is unconstitutional.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But if my friend from Tennessee will permit me, the President has said over and over again in the campaign, and since the campaign, that it was not the purpose of the Democratic Party to injure any industry in the United States, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has made a similar statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill on the report contained on pages 34 and 35 shows that under the chemical schedule—Schedule A—our increased importations will amount to \$18,864,345; under Schedule B, we are now considering, the increase is \$6,583,935; under the metal schedule, \$26,074,130; under the wool schedule, \$575,057; agriculture, \$10,035,844; spirits, \$4,463,767; cotton schedule, \$12,568,604; woolen schedule, \$20,692,626; silk schedule, \$10,289,490; paper and pulp, \$2,133,579; Schedule N, sundries, \$71,285,231. Under these schedules the increase of foreign-made goods to be sold in the American market the first year under this bill amount to \$183,566,620. Under Schedule F, the sugar schedule, the first 12 months shows a decrease of \$521,052. Under Schedule J, the flax and hemp schedule, a decrease of \$48,386,102, growing out of a transfer of certain articles from that schedule under a new arrangement to Schedule N, making a net total increase in foreign-made goods sold in the American market the first 12 months under this bill of \$135,659,466.

Under this bill we are going to take from the American workshops and the American wage earners business amounting in the first year to \$135,659,466. Sixty per cent of that amount in wages, at \$2.50 a day, would sustain 100,000 wage earners in the American mills for 12 months. I ask those in charge of this measure, and responsible for this proposed legislation, what are you going to do for these wage earners that you rob of \$136,000,000 in the output of their mills? What employment are you going to substitute for the employment that you take from them? And why should the American lawmaker legislate here to increase the output of foreign mills against American mills, where the capital is American money and where the men who own them are American citizens, giving employment to American wage earners at the highest known standard of wages? Yes; President Wilson's platform promised that no legitimate industry in this country should be injured. I ask the Representatives from Louisiana if the sugar industry in that State is a legitimate industry; I ask the Representatives on that side of the Chamber who represent Western States that are interested in the wool industry if the woolen business is a legitimate industry? I ask the men who represent the Democratic Party on the other side of the Chamber from the Southern States if the cotton mills, 850 in number in the South, are a legitimate industry under the interpretation of your platform? I ask you if the coal companies now shipping coal to New England from Maryland, Kentucky, and West Virginia are engaged in a legitimate industry in the eyes of the Democratic Party; and why should this business be turned over to the coal companies of Nova Scotia?

This side of the House believes in giving American orders to American mills and the work to American artisans, laborers, miners, and mechanics, as against foreigners. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment suggested, I desire to say that last year we produced 80,000,000 barrels of cement, to the value of \$66,000,000, and that we imported, in round numbers, \$247,000 worth and exported over \$5,000,000. We exported 20 times more than the amount we imported.

In addition to that, at the time of the building of the Panama Canal and the opening of the bids there was a contest as to who was to get the contract for the 4,500,000 barrels of cement that was to be furnished there, and while there were bids from a number of countries, the lowest bid was made by and the contract was awarded to an American bidder at a lower figure than any of the figures that were given by any of the foreign contractors, and it is very evident that the price in the United States is cheaper than abroad.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is that not a splendid argument for maintaining the 20 per cent duty that has been imposed on cement heretofore? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON] if he knows how those prices compare?

Mr. DIXON. I do not know that I can quote the exact figures. They are printed in the hearings.

Mr. RAINEY. I can give them. The contract for 4,500,000 barrels of cement was awarded to the Atlas Portland Cement Co., of Northampton County, Pa., at \$1.19 per barrel, and the bids of 14 foreign companies ranged from \$1.25 up to \$2.10. In connection with this contract I addressed this question to the Isthmian Canal Commission:

If the contract had been awarded to the foreign factories, would the foreign manufacturers have been compelled to pay any duty to the United States Government? In other words, was the tariff a factor at all in the bidding between American and foreign firms for cement?

The answer of the Isthmian Canal Commission was:

As a matter of fact the bids for foreign cement were all higher than the bid of the Atlas Portland Cement Co.

The figures are all printed here. Then I asked this question of the Isthmian Canal Commission:

Why was the contract awarded to the American bidders?

And the answer was:

Because they were the low bidders on a well-known Portland cement, which was perfectly satisfactory to the authorities on the Isthmus, and whose bid was strictly in accordance with our specifications.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does your report show the bid next to the lowest bidder—the Atlas Portland Cement Co.?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; the Portland Cement Co. works at Antwerp was \$1.25. The Wouldham Cement Co. was \$1.76, and so the bids run up. The bid of another German company was \$1.82.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 3, after the word "lime," strike out the figure "5," and insert "10."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while I have very little faith that I will get a favorable response from that side of the House toward protecting an American industry, yet in order that it may not be said that the rate which I offered in the amendment was too high and that given as an excuse, I offer the one now, which is practically the prevailing duty. I want to read a letter which I received from the owners of the lime plants in the northern tier of counties in Washington. These include all of the available limestone deposits in the Pacific Northwest. It is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., April 21, 1913.

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the owners of all the lime plants located in the northwestern tier of counties of this State, which practically includes all its available limestone deposits, I was delegated to take up and lay before you the conditions of this industry at the present time and to ask you to use your best endeavors to have the iniquitous tariff conditions we are now operating under adjusted on some fair and equitable basis.

The industries are owned by citizens of the State of Washington who have invested their capital and earnings, and many of them have spent the best years of their life in building up the business in the hope of securing a reasonable return on their venture, but for the last few years this has been impossible, owing to industrial conditions that have placed them at the mercy of competitors across the boundary line in British Columbia.

The lime deposits of British Columbia are located upon Vancouver Island and have deep-water transportation not only to the principal markets of their own country, but likewise to the principal markets of the States of Washington and Oregon. In addition to this the railroads absorb their local freight charges to interior points that puts them on an equality with our home manufactures, with the added privilege of employing Chinese labor which averages but \$1.75 per day, while the average white labor in the lime plants of this section is \$2.87½ per day.

At the limekilns in British Columbia, where the product is put up in barrels, the Chinese contract the cooperage at 5 cents per barrel, while our manufacturers are compelled to pay 7 cents per barrel. The British Columbia manufacturers were given by the Government of that country large areas of timbered lands from which to draw their fuel supply for burning the lime, and their average cost of wood ranges from \$1.40 to \$1.65 per cord, while the manufacturers of the State of Washington are compelled to pay from \$2.50 to \$3.25 per cord for the same class of wood delivered to their kilns.

These physical conditions are a very serious handicap to the lime manufacturers of this section when they have to come in competition with British Columbia manufacturers on equal terms, and much more so when our Government places a bounty in the shape of a preferential tariff in favor of these foreign manufacturers, as is the case at the present time and has been for some years last past.

The Canadian Government places a duty upon manufactured American lime and ground limestone going into Canada of 17½ cents ad valorem, which also includes the cost of the package, and compels our manufacturer to invoice his shipments at his selling price to jobbers, which means that we must pay a duty not only upon the manufacturing cost but also upon the anticipated profits. For violation of this clause or the slightest attempt at undervaluation they invoke what is known in

Canada as the dumping clause, which adds to the 17½ cents a penalty for double that amount. This places the ordinary duty of our lime entering Canada under the present prices at \$1.92½ per ton.

The United States Government, on the other hand, allows the Canadian manufacturer of lime to ship his products into this country at a specific tariff duty of \$1 per ton, with package free, notwithstanding the fact that the manufacturing cost of this package equals, if it does not exceed, the cost of the lime it contains, and they are then able to sell the empty barrels at from 10 cents to 15 cents each, in direct competition with the American cooperage factories, and which gives a tariff advantage to the Canadian manufacturer, in addition to all the other physical advantages, of from 92 cents to \$1.05 per ton, and makes this country the dumping ground for the surplus product of the British Columbia lime manufacturers, which they have been quick to take advantage of, as every manufacturer knows that the cost of producing a certain article is decreased in proportion to the increased volume of the output of the plant and his ability to keep his plant running continuously.

Just as an example and to show the actual conditions, I will quote two instances:

The Roche Harbor Lime Co.'s plant at Roche Harbor is one of the largest on the Pacific coast, operating 14 kilns, with an investment of more than \$1,000,000. For the past two years this plant has averaged but little more than two and one-half kilns in constant operation, and there have been times when not even a kiln was burning.

The Pacific Lime Co.'s plant of British Columbia has been during the same period running full blast and have installed additional kilns to more than double their capacity. The British Columbia markets have not been able to absorb their entire output, but with the very favorable tariff regulations they could very conveniently dump their surplus upon this market and cut the price below where it could be profitably produced by our own manufacturers.

When the schedule of tariffs for the bill now before Congress reached us, we find that instead of getting relief from the condition already prevailing it is proposed to wipe out the last vestige of industrial stability for this product by reducing the already low tariff by 50 per cent. It hardly seems reasonable to any citizen of this country that men elected to a high legislative office will deliberately plan to ruin their own citizens for the benefit of a foreigner or to carry out the theoretical idea of an economic problem. The placing of this tariff upon the statute books means nothing more or less than the formation of a trust between the United States Government and the British Columbia lime manufacturers which will destroy the property of their own countrymen, who are compelled to pay taxes from which the executioners derive a yearly revenue.

If the manufactured article in question was one in use by a class of people whose earning power was limited, or had any relation to the high cost of living or any of the various economic questions that confront us to-day, there might be some excuse for this action; but in this particular instance the contrary is true. Lime to-day is not used by the poor man. His house is plastered by a cheaper article than lime can possibly be produced, known as gypsum hard wall plaster. His chimneys, owing to the known danger of fire, are to a large extent laid up in cement mortar, and the use of lime therefore is largely restricted to brick and terra cotta construction in large and massive office buildings, factories, warehouses, and the like, and for which we, in turn, are compelled to pay the highest rate for occupancy and use. Therefore from an economic standpoint it has no relation whatever to the abstract question, but is purely one of business judgment.

On behalf, therefore, of the lime manufacturers of this country, and especially those of the Northwest, I have been delegated to file with our delegation a most emphatic protest against the reduction of the present tariff and to ask instead that a reciprocal tariff be demanded between these two countries, whose boundary line is imaginary instead of physical, and to ask that you use your best effort to see that this industry and the men who have invested their entire resources and years of effort be not destroyed.

The lime manufacturers of this section are not asking for protection, but justice, a fair field, and no favors, an equality of opportunity to invade the foreign field on the same terms and conditions that they are allowed to enter here, and we submit that under the present conditions we are entitled to a specific duty of \$2 per ton on manufactured lime entering this country from foreign ports.

If it is impossible to raise the tariff on this class of goods shipped from British Columbia into the United States equal to that demanded by the Canadian Government at the present time, that some provision be made whereby the President and his Cabinet would have the right, after proper investigation, where certain tariffs were working hardships against the citizens of the United States and no other redress was possible, to suspend the tariff and make it equal to that of the foreign country. This is now being done, and has been for years, in Canada, where the tariff law can be changed at will by the simple process of making what is known as "An order in council."

Trusting that you will give this question your prompt attention and be able to secure some reasonable adjustment on a fair basis to the citizens of this country, I remain,

Very respectfully,

J. J. MAURY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not that letter clearly indicate that your people were trying to dump on Canada at a rate less than they were selling to the American people, and were attempting to engage in the business of invading the Canadian markets instead of the Canadian invading your market? It seems to me quite a clear inference from the letter the gentleman has read.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What they did wish to do was to have a fair opportunity with the Canadian manufacturer. The manufacturers in Washington have largely reduced their output. It is not likely that we would invade the British Columbia market to any extent when you remember that it costs more for the fuel that we use, more for the labor that we use, and when they have the advantage of foreign cheap tonnage to reach our markets, which we do not have. They have the advantage in labor, in material, and in trans-

portation and I hope the Democratic Party will not take away what little protection we now have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

76. Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, ground or calcined, pearl hardening for paper makers' use, Keene's cement, or other cement of which gypsum is the component material of chief value, and cements not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 18, line 7, by inserting, after the word "and," the following: "all other building."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 76 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "76. Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, 30 cents per ton; if ground or calcined, \$1.75 per ton; pearl hardening for paper makers' use, 20 per cent ad valorem; Keene's cement, or other cement of which gypsum is the component material of chief value, if valued at \$10 per ton or less, \$3.50 per ton; if valued above \$10 and not above \$15 per ton, \$5 per ton; if valued above \$15 and not above \$30 per ton, \$10 per ton; if valued above \$30 per ton, \$14 per ton."

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, if I am correctly informed, the Dingley bill was the first law to put a tariff upon gypsum. That law provided a tax of 50 cents a ton on crude gypsum. The Payne bill reduced that from 50 cents a ton to 30 cents per ton, and that is the rate now placed on crude gypsum. The provision in the bill we now have under consideration provides for 10 per cent ad valorem. That would be a reduction of about 60 per cent. I think the ad valorem rate under the present law on the importations for 1910 is 27 per cent, and for 1912 it is 25 per cent, so that it makes a reduction of about 60 per cent.

I do not understand, of course, why this reduction should be made. There was very strenuous objection to the reductions that were made in the Payne law. Gypsum is a very abundant article in the United States, being found, I think, in western New York, in Michigan, in Virginia in large quantities, and in Iowa, Utah, California, Texas, and Oklahoma. There are very large deposits in the State of Oklahoma. Prof. Charles N. Gould, who is now the State geologist of Oklahoma, in an article in Mining Science, December 12, 1907, on page 542, says:

The gypsum area, of which the Oklahoma beds form a part, is the largest in the United States. The area extends practically uninterceptedly from southern Nebraska across Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, nearly to the Pecos River. It is not to be understood that the line of outcrops is entirely continuous, but that throughout this entire distance the rocks are more or less impregnated with gypsum. Over a considerable part of this area, however, the outcrops are continuous, and one may travel 200 miles or more and not once be out of sight of heavy gypsum ledges. The line of outcrops from southern Nebraska to west-central Texas is approximately 600 miles long. The width of the area containing gypsum varies from a few miles to more than 100 miles. Oklahoma is in the center of the region, and the most extensive deposits are in that State. The amount of gypsum in Oklahoma is practically inexhaustible. With perhaps two exceptions, every county west of the main line of the Rock Island Railroad contains enough material to supply the United States with cement and plaster for an indefinite length of time.

The congressional district which I represent is the heart of that gypsum deposit. There are seven or eight gypsum mills in my district. They employ a large number of men—I can not state the exact number—and add largely to our wealth. The gypsum that was imported comes from Canada, and is mostly crude gypsum. I do not think any good can come to the country at large by reducing the tariff on gypsum. Thirty cents a ton is a very small and insignificant duty. Now, if you reduce it down to 10 or 15 cents a ton you might as well put it on the free list.

Under the present law the importations of gypsum have been increasing from year to year. It seems to me that when we have in this country an article or product of any kind in large quantities, scattered through various States in every section of the Union, it is bad policy to invite importations from a foreign country, to open our markets to their products, when the industry is capable of development to a scale that will absolutely supply our needs in every way at all times.

Mr. DIXON. I do not think the gentleman need fear about the gypsum in Oklahoma. The freight rate from the seaboard will be ample protection for the Oklahoma gypsum.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that the testimony before the committee showed that the mills in Virginia, instead of supplying the eastern market, have to send their products west, and that crowds and restricts and limits the

field for the Oklahoma product? Is not that true? Was not that the testimony?

Mr. DIXON. The hearings did disclose the fact that in the regions named they did ship some of their products to some parts of the West; but does the gentleman desire that there shall be no market in the West for any other gypsum except that of Oklahoma?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. As long as gypsum comes out of American soil, I am willing that it should come to Oklahoma, but I protest against going to a foreign country to procure crude gypsum.

Mr. DIXON. There are 17 States in the Union that produce gypsum. Last year we produced about \$13,000,000 worth in the United States. There was about \$400,000 worth imported into the United States. Gypsum is being used more and more all the time for the making of wall plaster, and it is becoming a necessity in all parts of the country. This is an effort to lower the price to the builders of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that this reduction in gypsum is made especially to help out the people who live in the Northeast, where they get the most protection for their manufactured articles, and that it is in response to a demand made from a section that should not object to protection on an article that is produced in the West?

Mr. DIXON. In the making of this tariff bill there was no section recognized. We tried to treat all parts of the Union alike.

In addition to this, gypsum is used as a fertilizer, and it ought to be made as cheap as possible for the farmers of this country. All other fertilizers are on the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, gypsum is used on farm lands. It is not a fertilizer, but it has the property of attracting moisture, which, of course, is beneficial to growing crops, grasses, and things of that kind.

Mr. DIXON. It is used like lime.

Mr. PAYNE. When I was a boy on a farm I used to drive for about 10 miles to a gypsum mill and draw home some gypsum that was always put upon the grass, and it operated in the way I have stated. When we were adjusting the rate upon gypsum rock I took a good deal of pains with it, to get the facts, in order that the duty might be properly adjusted.

The greatest competition that comes from gypsum rock is about New York City and along the New England coast, the rock coming from Nova Scotia. Being near the ocean, of course, it is loaded into the vessels and goes down very cheaply. Competition is sharpest right there about New York City and the mills along the coast that get their gypsum rock from somewhere a little west in the interior. The problem was to adjust the duties so as to furnish the difference in the cost of labor in acquiring the rock at these near-by places, near where most of the cement was manufactured out of the gypsum, to be used in the eastern cities for the purpose of building. I got it so nearly adjusted that I sacrificed one or two interests in my own district in doing it. The gypsum quarries were closed on account of the low duties in the bill. I thought they might be when they put the duty on, but I was trying to make a bill for the country and not for my own district. I heard from that locality in the election, but I told them frankly what I had done and that I thought I was right about it; and while I lost votes I did not lose my self-respect. I think the duty was adjusted at about the right figure, and that a less vigorous reduction than that proposed in this bill ought to satisfy the gentlemen who are making a purely revenue bill. I think they would get more revenue out of a duty more nearly approaching the duty we left upon it in 1909. I do not know that I have anything further to say on the subject. I never was in favor of protecting from the eastern trade or for the eastern trade this gypsum in Oklahoma or in Iowa. I remember a good many years ago one member of the committee—and I will not speak of his locality, for he is dead now—who wanted to protect some of that western gypsum rock. I fought him then as I have always tried to fight for a reasonable duty that made up the difference in the cost, and not an excessive duty on all these articles.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman from New York was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means when the Dingley bill was put into law.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. That bill passed the House with gypsum on the free list and it was put on the dutiable list in the Senate.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; that is correct. And in the McKinley bill there was a duty upon gypsum, but the duty that was put on in the Senate in the Dingley bill was more nearly right than the Senate sometimes gets the duty when a bill gets over there. The experience we had under the Dingley bill showed it was more nearly right, and I tried to adjust it in

the light of the experience we had under that law when we were adjusting this duty in 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 4, after the word "crude," strike out "ground or calcined," and in line 8, same page, after the words "ad valorem," insert a semicolon and the words "plaster rock or gypsum, ground or calcined, \$1.75 a ton."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the cases that seems to have justified Mr. Hancock in declaring the tariff to be a local issue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has just explained the difficulties that confronted him in endeavoring to adjust the tariff bill to meet the wishes of the various sections of the country. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] has spoken for gypsum in its crude state, as it originates in his section of the country. Along the Atlantic seaboard the question arises as to the payment of the enormous freight rates on bulky material like this that would have to be paid from Oklahoma or Minnesota or Michigan or any of the Western States. Of course the question of the cost of building construction arises when these freights are considered. It would be far cheaper to bring gypsum from across the water, from France or Germany, than it would be to bring it in from Oklahoma to the eastern section of the country. Those of us who believe in protection desire to be consistent in the matter, although as a result of the proposed change in the Underwood bill we are told that at least one enterprise to construct a factory for the manufacture of Keene's cement has already been discontinued. It is apparent that if the duty on ground or calcined cement, which is the manufactured product of gypsum, goes into effect, then the industry along the east coast will be seriously affected. It is asked that a duty of \$1.75 per ton be permitted to remain upon the manufactured article.

If it does not so remain, then it will be entirely within the power of those who are controlling the quarries in Nova Scotia, taking advantage of the lower rate of duty proposed in this bill and the freight rates due to local conditions, to enter the eastern market and put out of business those who are now engaged in the manufacture of cement or calcined plaster, which enters so materially into the cost of construction of the homes of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

78. Clays or earths, unwrought or unmanufactured, not specially provided for in this section, 50 cents per ton; wrought or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, \$1 per ton; china clay or kaolin, \$1.25 per ton; fuller's earth, unwrought and unmanufactured, 75 cents per ton; wrought or manufactured, \$1.50 per ton; fluorspar, \$1.50 per ton; limestone-rock asphalt, asphaltum, and bitumen, 50 cents per ton; *Provided*, That the weight of the casks or other containers shall be included in the dutiable weight.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 18, line 20, by inserting after the word "asphalt" the following: "25 cents per ton."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is the amendment?

Mr. DIXON. The amendment is, after "limestone-rock asphalt," to make the rate 25 cents per ton, leaving the other as it is. Fifty cents is the present rate, and the other items have been cut, and this amendment will make this in harmony with them.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The Republicans carried that amendment through.

The Clerk read as follows:

80. Common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware made of natural unwashed and unmixt clay; plain or embossed, common salt-glazed stoneware; stoneware and earthenware crucibles; all the foregoing, not ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner, 15 per cent ad valorem; if ornamented, incised, or decorated in any manner and manufactures wholly or in chief value of such ware, 20 per cent ad valorem; Rockingham earthenware, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, if I thought anything I could say here or any motion I could make correcting these rates would have any effect I would change all of these rates with reference to crockery and earthenware and china and put them as they are under the present law. I would inquire whether the gentleman from Indiana, who has charge of this schedule, as I understand, will be as fair and frank as the

gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] in dealing with the last schedule, when in answer to some inquiries put to him by myself and some other gentlemen he said they were not making any tariff for the manufacturers; that he did not care anything about that and did not propose to put any protection on the articles under consideration. This crockery schedule is all on a competitive basis. About \$10,000,000 worth of crockery and earthenware are now imported; about \$16,000,000 worth are manufactured in this country.

Ten millions are imported at the import price, the foreign price. Most of the crockery in this schedule is imported, far more than the domestic production in certain lines. Ten million dollars at the foreign price would amount to more than double the manufacture in the American price.

In china alone there is four times as much imported as made in this country; something like \$8,000,000 being imported and only about \$2,000,000 in value being made in this country. Now, if the principle of the competitive tariff, as to which the gentleman from Alabama has spoken so eloquently to-day, is to be put into effect anywhere why not put it into effect in regard to this schedule, and if the gentleman from Indiana, who has charge of this schedule, cares nothing about the manufacturers who make these articles, does he and his party care nothing about the workmen who are employed in the factories and who receive 50 to 55 per cent of the value of the products that they are turning out in their wages? Well might the gentleman from Tennessee ask what does the Democratic majority propose to do with those men who are employed by these factories, for they can not continue at the same wages and sell at the same prices as now under this proposed tariff. More goods are imported now in one class, one of the most important classes—china—than are made here, and it is easy to see that the foreigner really has an advantage now, and if this competitive tariff that we have heard about does not mean simply competition with the low wages of Europe, then this schedule ought to be changed. But I have no expectation that that will be done. I expect that the majority will continue to make rates here regardless of what becomes of the American workman and the American laborer.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield for a statement there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under this paragraph that we are now considering, \$1, we will increase the amount of foreign-made goods in the first year of the Underwood bill by \$1,400,000 in round numbers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is in the figures in the handbook.

Mr. AUSTIN. In the handbook.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think they are altogether too small in some instances.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know they have been repudiated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But that much, at least, is contemplated and intended to be imported.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If the rates of duty provided by law on this class of goods were strictly enforced the amount of protection given to the industry would be an entirely different matter. I have been reliably informed on several occasions, this being an ad valorem rate of duty, that many undervaluations have been discovered on importations. In fact, one gentleman, Mr. Burgess, president, I believe, of the pottery association, made the statement before the Ways and Means Committee four years ago that they had discovered that on chinaware tea sets which had been imported into this country, when ferreted out and run down, were found to have been manufactured in Belgium, and the Belgium house had a house in Paris and a house in New York under an assumed name or different name, but when the truth was known they were all one institution.

Those goods were consigned by the Belgium manufacturer to the Paris house at a price far below their manufactured cost, and in turn assigned to the New York house at a price far below their value, thus evading the law, evading the payment of the just rate of duty on those goods that were provided for by law, and some \$9,000,000 worth had come into this country at less than \$5,000,000 in value, and a duty was paid on \$5,000,000 instead of \$9,000,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was going to ask my friend why, when he wrote the Payne bill, he did not remedy that condition?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman—and I will be candid with you—that a specific rate of duty can be placed on chinaware. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You are talking about consigned goods. It is very easily remedied. We have remedied it in this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. You have not. You have an ad valorem duty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman was complaining about the fact that on these consigned goods the valuation was not fixed. If the gentleman will look at the administrative features of this bill he will find we have a clause in here that compels them to fix the rate.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not contradicting or complaining. You have undoubtedly gone as far as you could to correct the error. I will say to the gentleman that I have a list of the names of importers that have robbed this Government of the just rate of duty on many kinds of goods, both on the specific and ad valorem rates, as provided for in the law. We have laws that punish severely the crime of murder and many other crimes, but, God knows, there is no law written that will make all men honest. What I am trying to impress upon you is this, that you have reduced the rate of duty on those goods, and to-day, and for many years past, and it will occur in the future, there have been violations of law in undervaluation. There is no question about that. To read over a list that has been furnished me by the Treasury Department of prosecutions in the last four or five years leads me to believe that the average importer is an inveterate smuggler.

I have the amount of money furnished to me in figures by the Treasury Department of fines and penalties that have been paid by some of the largest importers in this country, and it is astounding. The sugar companies alone that have been here asking for lower rates of duty or free trade could not get lower duties under the Payne law, except by stealing it. Some of those responsible are now serving time in State prison for underweighing and undervaluation and fraudulent drawbacks, and have paid four millions and some three or four hundred thousand dollars in fines.

Mr. MADDEN. That is due to the adoption of an ad valorem instead of a specific duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will not say that, because a duty, whether specific or ad valorem, will not prevent a man from being dishonest and underweighing, which was the charge against those people.

Mr. MADDEN. It will give them an opportunity to undervalue.

Mr. FORDNEY. I fear so. I am very much opposed to ad valorem duty. I think with a specific duty there is less opportunity for fraud. I may be wrong about it, but, Mr. Chairman, I would, if I could, induce the gentleman to put the rate of duty back where it is under existing law, because I do not believe the rate you have fixed in this bill will give adequate protection to that industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to have just one minute more? I do not want to violate the rule. I have not taken up any time heretofore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not like to have speeches run over five minutes by a single Member.

Mr. FORDNEY. Only one minute, if the gentleman please.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I shall not object.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will not take up any more time than necessary.

I have here a statement furnished to me showing that in white ware the labor cost of production alone in this country is 55 per cent of the total cost of the manufacture of that article, not allowing for the labor cost in the material used. And in white ware and a small amount of decorated ware 58 per cent is the labor cost, and in another article 64.2 per cent is the labor cost. Therefore I do not believe that a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem or 40 per cent ad valorem is a sufficient duty to offset the cost of production in this country.

I shall offer an amendment to the next paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on line 24, page 19, the figures "40" and insert "50."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Where was the amendment intended for?

Mr. MOORE. For line 24, on page 19.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That paragraph has not been reached yet.

Mr. DIXON. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], who has been talking about the interests of the manufacturers, that there has not been a single manufacturer—and there have been a large number who appeared before the committee—who has made the slightest objection to the rates in this paragraph.

All that the gentleman from Iowa has been talking about is in reference to paragraphs that we have not yet reached. Un-

der this paragraph the American production is about \$14,000,000. The importations are only \$150,000. They are all bulky and heavy, and that fact alone is practically all the protection that the American manufacturers would need, and there has been no criticism by those gentlemen themselves in reference to this paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, did not the gentleman understand me to say I was speaking in reference to both paragraphs?

Mr. DIXON. I supposed the gentleman was speaking on the paragraph that was pending before the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did I not speak expressly with reference to that and the following paragraph?

Mr. DIXON. Probably the gentleman did.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I do that for the purpose of gaining some information about the next preceding paragraph, which was passed over before I realized it—the mica paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana as to the reasons that led the committee to modify the present duties upon mica.

Mr. DIXON. The Democrats have never believed in a compound duty—a specific and an ad valorem duty together—and the committee concluded to put in simply the ad valorem duty instead of a compound duty. That is the reason.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is the real reason for the change?

Mr. DIXON. That is the reason. The rates are not materially changed. The rate here is 30 per cent, and under the old law it was about 35 per cent.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. On the basis of the importations of 1912 the rate is 34.19 per cent, and the new rate is 30 per cent.

Mr. DIXON. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course you allow for additional importations of about \$40,000 and a reduction of some \$5,000 in revenue.

If the gentleman will bear with me for a word on that schedule, I will say that it is true that the reductions are not large, but I was not sure as to the controlling reasons why you should make that much of a change in an industry that is new and growing. The product of this manufacture is used largely as an insulator in electrical machinery.

Mr. PAYNE. I will explain it to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would be glad if the gentleman would.

Mr. PAYNE. The committee has fixed about the same rates as at present. They could not bring themselves to an exact indorsement of the present law, so they put on an ad valorem rate that is pretty nearly as good.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. They are losing about \$5,000 of revenue.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is aware of the fact that mica is an important industry of an important district in North Carolina. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That may save us somewhat in South Dakota, which produces more mica than any State in the Union at the present time. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will proceed just for a moment. Of course, in the great multiplication of electrical machinery mica becomes an important American product. Outside of what is made in the United States, it comes chiefly from a small importation from Canada, and the rest, I believe, from India. Of course, it is unnecessary to say that in competing with the labor of India we are competing with about the cheapest labor in the world—something like 8 cents a day.

In the last few years the production of mica in my State has increased until it produces about two-thirds of the mica that is made in the United States. With the continuation even of present conditions, which can properly be met by this great and rich manufacturing electrical industry, which takes the product for insulation, in a very few years it can manufacture all the mica that we consume here at home, notwithstanding that the electrical industry is growing and its demands will be greater.

As a protectionist—although I believe in only moderate protection—of course I should hate to see, even in an effort to apply a theory to this tariff revision, any serious disturbance of an industry that will become quite important if allowed to grow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I know that some of our friends who, when they have been in power, have always protected their own are very desirous of finding some place where the majority on this side have protected something that is located in their own States. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], showing his lack of information about a tariff bill, missed it far when he shot at North Carolina. The mica in North Carolina is low-grade mica, and the only way in which it could be protected, if you wanted to protect it, would be under a compound rate. The mica that is actually imported is a high-grade mica, and a 30 per cent rate will be a good revenue rate on that high-grade mica; but on the low-grade mica it is a very low rate and does not accomplish the result.

The committee did not desire greatly to reduce the rate because of our importations and because of the competitive feature; but as mica varies very much from high-grade mica to low-grade mica, we found that under the compound rate there are some anomalies in this schedule. I believe one witness came before us and stated that there was a sample of mica that had come to the customhouse upon which, under the compound rate, the duty amounted to an equivalent ad valorem of 3,000 per cent, if I recollect aright, on account of the very low grade of the mica. Of course, this was an unusual case. So we found that as mica varied so much in quality there was no specific rate you could levy which would not make the equivalent ad valorem on the low-grade mica very much higher than on the high-grade mica. We did not want to do this; and when you come to these compound rates, it makes the duty on part of the mica absolutely prohibitive, where on the other part it is competitive. For that reason, in order to try to make competition all along the line, the compound rate was stricken out and an ad valorem rate was adopted, although in the general average there is not a great amount of reduction.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in answer to the old-fashioned, stock Republican argument which has been presented here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] against the ad valorem rates in this bill. It is true that all through the bill, in accordance with Democratic precedent and Democratic belief, we have written ad valorem rates wherever we thought they were practicable and workable.

There are objections which may be urged against ad valorem rates; but the truth is that every objection which can be raised against an ad valorem rate can be raised with equal force against a compound rate, which consists of a specific with an ad valorem in addition thereto, because in each of those cases it is necessary for the appraiser, in order to fix the rate, to fix the value of the imported article. Further than that, every argument which can be offered against an ad valorem rate can be offered against value classifications. All through the tariff law are numerous divisions of articles according to their values, different rates being written for the different values. The Payne law, like the Dingley law, was filled with compound rates and with value classifications. In writing this bill we have taken out practically all of the compound rates, and we have taken out of it practically all of the value classifications, leaving very few. And we have made so great a reduction in the number of classifications in the bill by reason of these changes that while I have not made the calculation, and can not speak with exactness, I am satisfied that we do not have any more ad valorem rates in this bill than there were compound rates and value classifications in the Payne law, so that the inducement for undervaluation, by reason of these ad valorem rates, is no larger in the present law than the law which it supersedes.

I want to say one further thing: That I think gentlemen will find that under the administration conducted by the party which believes that the first interest in the receipts of the customhouse is that of the Government rather than that of interested parties, either producers or importers, you will find during the next four years, during the operation of this law, less undervaluations than you have found under the Payne law. Why, it is currently reported that a great importer, a great merchant in the city of Philadelphia, a man who in days gone has performed great service for the Republican Party, who has collected enormous campaign funds from the beneficiaries of the tariff laws in the State of Pennsylvania for the use of the Republican Party, and who has held a high place in the Government under a Republican administration, came to Washington on the 3d of March, within 24 hours of the time that the Republican administration was to go out of power, and settled with the Treasury Department fraudulent-entry cases at the port of Philadelphia, extending over 10 or 12 years and involving an amount of more than \$100,000.

On the very eve of the Democratic administration coming into power that was done, because of the fear that the Democratic

administration would look out for the interests of the Government and see that the revenue honestly levied should be honestly paid into the Treasury.

I am glad to say that that act was largely responsible for the cleaning out of the Philadelphia customhouse by the present administration, and the President has appointed for collector of the port of Philadelphia a man under whom no such conduct can prevail in the future, a man who made his reputation in Pennsylvania by prosecuting capitol grafters and robbers, a man whose only enemies are ex-Republican State officials and State officeholders, now or recently residing in the State penitentiary. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am satisfied that these ad valorem rates will bring the amount which the Government is entitled to under the law. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. My time has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. As to the first part of the gentleman's statements in regard to a distinguished individual to whom he has made reference I have no knowledge. It is an interesting statement, and, of course, the gentleman is responsible for it. But as to the irregularities in the Philadelphia customhouse being responsible for the recent change in the collectorship I think there is considerable doubt. The collector of the port of Philadelphia, who has just given way to the principal protégé of my friend on the other side [Mr. PALMER], the new leader of the new Democracy in Pennsylvania, did not resign the office as he was requested to do, desiring to know whether any charges had been filed against him. And while his term of office had not expired, and it is to be presumed that charges would be preferred against him, or that there would be some political justification, or civil-service justification, for his removal, he is to be deliberately removed because the Secretary of the Treasury in response to the collector's personal demand declared that he preferred to have some one in that office who was "in sympathy" with the administration. There were no charges, because the gentleman himself asked if there was any charge against him, and was told there was not.

This was the first evidence of a desire of the party in power, those who are now in control of the administration, to get the offices in Pennsylvania and to let the collectors of the ports throughout the country know that the time had come for a change. The Democrats wanted the jobs. [Applause.] I do not blame the gentlemen for wanting the jobs.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I do not blame Democrats for wanting the jobs.

I do not blame the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] for coming in here and getting them as fast as he can. I congratulate him on the supreme control he has, not only over the warring Democratic factions in Pennsylvania, but over the White House itself, which up to this time has yielded to no man in this country except to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in removing without cause a Republican collector against whom they could find nothing, and whose term of office had not expired.

[Mr. DIES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a few moments ago indulged in some observations on the question of ad valorem duties. He said that the mixed duty—that is, the combination of the specific duty and the ad valorem duty—was just as bad as an ad valorem duty. That was substantially his affirmation. A specific duty upon a pound of goods or some unit of goods by which they are measured can not be evaded. It is simply a matter of weight or measurement, and that can not be got around, unless by connivance of somebody, and so far as that specific duty goes it is absolute. If there is an ad valorem duty in addition to that, a portion of the ad valorem duty may be evaded. But a mixed duty is as much better than an ad valorem duty as the specific duty upon an article is in proportion to the ad valorem duty. The gentleman thought they had not put any more ad valorem duties into this bill than to take the place of the ad valorems in the present law and the specific and ad valorem mixed. What a memory these gentlemen have!

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Just a minute.

Mr. PALMER. But I did not say that.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. PALMER. I said that I did not believe there were more ad valorem rates in this bill than there were ad valorem, compound, and value classifications in the Payne bill.

Mr. PAYNE. That amounts to pretty nearly the same thing. Mr. Chairman, it is strange how these gentlemen seem to

have forgotten what was in the bill. I had to remind the chairman of several important items that had absolutely slipped his memory, some of them since he made his speech on last Monday, and now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has overlooked the last item under discussion, the subject of lime, where there is a specific rate in the present law, and an ad valorem rate in this, and they run all through the bill. I only speak of it in order to recall the gentleman's recollection to a recent event. Of course, every country has discarded ad valorem rates wherever a specific rate is practicable. Great Britain held on to it the longest, but during the last four or five years she has been getting rid of her ad valorem rates and returning to more specific rates of duty. Every Secretary of the Treasury of the United States condemned the ad valorem except the patron saint of Democracy, Mr. Walker, the man who made a tariff bill that they refer to with pride, but would not if they understood what it was. Now, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of the ad valorem rate is on the valuation of the goods. Four years ago I took hold of this subject to see if I could not work out a section of the bill and put it in there. It has so commended itself to you that you retain it verbatim. I think it is section 11 of the administrative features of the bill. The difficulty is when you put on an ad valorem duty these people immediately go to work to see how they are going to evade it, and they do evade it by taking the whole product of the factory and having it consigned to them generally on a false invoice and false prices. Duties should be levied on the market value of the goods in the place where manufactured, but there was no market value of the goods.

There was no sale except to this single consignee in the United States, and to no other country. They were not freely offered for sale, and then the problem came how to value these goods. Well, it struck me in case of no market value abroad it would be a good thing to take the market value at which those goods were sold in the United States and work backward, deduct the duty paid or which should be paid, deduct the item of freight and insurance and the fees, the percentage of the consignee, if any was actually paid, not exceeding 6 per cent, and let that be the valuation. That worked pretty well for a while. They were afraid of it, I am told, and there were more correct valuations and more attempts to get market values abroad. But some importer came over here with some goods one day and fell into the hands of the authorities, and the attorney before one of the boards of appraisers over here in New York proved that there was no market value at the place where the goods were manufactured, and sat down with the usual smile upon his countenance of such gentleman, the attorney for the importer thinking that he had won his case. The attorney for the Government immediately took up the question of the market value at which those goods were sold in the United States, and worked backward to prove his case—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Have I had five minutes? I would like to have a little more time on this question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman; I do not want to surrender the right about maintaining the five-minute rule, but the gentleman is the senior Member on the committee, and I will not object to his proceeding; but I ask unanimous consent that when the gentleman from New York concludes, the debate on this particular paragraph conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the gentleman from New York concludes, debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close. Is there objection?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes on this.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On this paragraph?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. The next paragraph is on crockery also.

Mr. POWERS. I can take time then.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I had gotten to the point where the case had been rested before the subboard of appraisers, consisting of three gentlemen, and then the importer asked for an adjournment of the case, and it was adjourned from time to time for three or four months, the attorney for the United States trying to push it forward, and finally they got ready for a hearing, and, lo and behold, they proved that during the adjournment some man had gone over there where these goods were manufactured and freely offered them for sale to three or four interested parties, the same goods at the same price that the consignee had imported them into the United States,

and they came and proved that before the board of appraisers, and that board of appraisers allowed that sort of thing to get around this statute. I am glad to say that the board of appraisers will never repeat this operation again in the United States, because some things have happened since that was done, and probably this valuation paragraph or section will prove of some benefit.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is almost a hopeless case. We can not catch them for perjury; we can not get hold of their books. We are at their mercy. It happened a while ago, in the examination of one of these cases, that they were showing their books, and some sharp fellow from the customhouse got to musing around a little and got hold of a letter book and opened it. They said, "Oh, this is a private letter book." He said, "This letter does not seem to be private," and he read a letter from the man here, to whom the goods were consigned, to the factory in which all the parties were interested on the other side, which said, "I inclose a check for 47,000 francs to cover the difference between the cost of those products in our factories over there and the prices put into the consignment"—the consignment being the price on which they paid the duty. We are open to all sorts of fraud when we have these ad valorem duties, and that is why every enlightened nation on the globe has, wherever it is practicable, a specific duty, in order to avoid fraud in the undervaluation of goods by the importers. And all the importers are not Republicans; most of them who come before the committee are Democrats. The Democrats are sometimes as honest as Republicans and they are sometimes as dishonest as Republicans. Dishonesty does not belong to any one particular party. Avoidance of customs rates does not belong to any one political party; fraudulent valuations do not belong to any particular party. As long as there is a feeling of graft among merchants there is a loose feeling that permits a man to go to work and cheat the Government out of the revenue, and he thinks he is not doing anything morally wrong as long as he avoids State prison, and he gloats over it. As long as that is the feeling among the people of the United States you will have fraud and undervaluations in the customhouse. I am glad I never have had a hand in making ad valorem rates to tempt this fraud, wherever specific rates were practicable. On crockery they are not practicable; they can not work out; and so you have to have ad valorem rates on crockery.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALEXANDER). The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

81. Earthenware and crockery were composed of a nonvitrified absorbent body, including white granite and semiporcelain earthenware, and cream-colored ware, and stoneware, including clock cases with or without movements; pill tiles, plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware; if plain white, plain yellow, plain brown, plain red, or plain black, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem; if painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner, and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 19, line 13, by striking out the semicolon at the end of the line and inserting in lieu thereof a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 21, strike out "35" and insert "55."

In line 24 strike out the figures "40" and insert "60."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment chiefly for reasons that I gave a few minutes ago, but I will go further and say that I have here a statement of the difference in wages paid abroad and here, which is a good or fair illustration of why, in my opinion, 35 per cent ad valorem and 40 per cent ad valorem is not a rate sufficiently high to offset the difference in cost of production here and abroad. The wages paid here, as given in a number of instances, to plate makers, to jiggersmen, dish makers, cup makers, saucer makers, handlers, pressers, dippers, sagger makers, mold makers, throwers, turners, kilnmen, and transfer girls are shown, and the average wages in England is \$6.65 a week as against the average wages paid for the same kind of work in the United States of \$25.57

a week, or about 25 per cent of the wages paid in Europe that is paid in this country for the same class of work.

Mr. Chairman, I submit then that 40 per cent ad valorem is sufficient to offset the difference in the cost.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman tell me where he got those figures?

Mr. FORDNEY. I got those figures from a pamphlet which was handed to me, and I think they are given in the United States reports.

Mr. MOORE. You got it on page 4.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] if it is not the brief of Mr. Burgess, one of the pottery manufacturers, who was pleading for higher duty?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think it is, although it is not signed by Mr. Burgess.

Mr. Chairman, in this country, as the figures given here show, the percentage of female labor as compared with male labor is 100 males to 20 females; in England 100 males to 80 females; and in Germany 100 males to 300 females. Some gentleman asked the question here the other day why it is in England the wages are higher than in any other country in Europe. That is rather a hard question to answer, but I can give my explanation of it if some man will answer this question for me.

I will speak now of something about which I know something. I do not like to talk about a matter unless I know what I am talking about. I am in the lumber business, and the men in the lumber woods of the State of Mississippi to-day receive in round figures an average of \$1.80, and for the same class of labor in the State of Washington they receive \$3.25 a day.

That is the difference that exists in the United States for the same class of work, and when you describe the difference between the wages paid in the mills of Germany and of France and of England, you should take into consideration the question of how much of that labor is female labor in one country as against the proportion employed in another country. I have shown the female labor in Germany in those factories constitutes 75 per cent of their employees, while in England it constitutes but 44.4 per cent.

I believe that would answer the question which that gentleman asked the other day. But there are many elements that might make up this difference in cost. It is a fact to-day that the wages in the lumber woods in the State of Mississippi are lower than they are in the State of Washington in the United States, where your measure of protection and my measure of protection is fixed by the same yardstick, where the measure of protection in the States of Oregon and Washington in the lumber business is identical with the measure of protection in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is not that because one laborer is white and the other black?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not necessarily so, because the white laborer in Mississippi receives the wages I have described to you, namely, \$1.80 a day. I know it because I am paying it, my friends, right now, and I have got the figures to show that.

It is true that colored labor is cheaper than white labor, generally. But why is it, my friends, that the labor in your cotton mills in North Carolina and South Carolina is only 80 cents a day on the average, while the average wage in the cotton mills of Massachusetts is \$1.38 a day?

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] stated the other day that there was no colored labor in the cotton mills of the South. The gentleman is mistaken. I have been in the cotton mills of the South and I know that the common labor in the cotton mills of the South is generally colored labor.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the committee did in fact separate crockery and earthenware, and in that respect our bill differs from the specifications and classifications in the Payne bill. We placed china and porcelain in one paragraph and earthenware in another paragraph, because we believed that chinaware was more of a luxury, and that therefore the rate on chinaware should be higher. For that reason we reduced the rate there only 5 per cent. But as to the ordinary earthenware, which is used by the people generally over the United States, we believed that the rates under the Payne law were unduly high, and for that reason we separated them, in order to put a higher tax upon the article of luxury than upon the article of ordinary use or the article of necessity.

We reduced the duty on earthenware from 55 and 60 per cent down to these rates, and we do not believe that these rates will in any factory in this country justify the reduction of the wages of a single employee.

It may be true, and it is true, that the wage of an American laborer per day, measured in money, is greater than that of the laborers of any other country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I do not care to be interrupted at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. DIXON. But measured by the sure test of the productiveness of that labor, we claim that the American laborer is not the highest paid in the world, although he is the most efficient and the most intelligent and the most productive in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, we have not changed the present law in regard to the tax on the crates or bundles in which this earthenware is packed, and that will give these gentlemen an additional rate over that amount, and we believe that the rate provided in this bill is ample to cover any alleged difference between the cost of labor abroad and at home.

But that was not the basis upon which this bill was written. It was believed that by lowering the duties to that amount there would be some competition. There is \$15,000,000 of earthenware of this classification produced in the United States. Of imported there was about a million and a half dollars' worth. It is estimated that there will be more importations under this bill, but not an undue amount, and that the American production will continue at about the same amount as it is at the present time.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DIXON. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know anything about the correctness of the figures, except the source from which they come. I hold in high esteem as an estimable, honest gentleman the man who gave me the figures, or sent them to me.

Mr. DIXON. I have a copy of them.

Mr. FORDNEY. He said here that the consumption of china and earthen ware in this country was \$37,000,000, of which \$15,000,000 has been produced in this country.

Mr. DIXON. I think he puts the selling price of the importations instead of the price at which they were imported.

Mr. FORDNEY. He says, in the middle of the first line, "the wholesale value."

Mr. DIXON. On what page?

Mr. FORDNEY. The first page:

The total consumption (wholesale value) of china and earthen ware, such as is made in Trenton and East Liverpool, is about \$37,000,000, of which about \$15,000,000 worth is made in the United States.

Mr. DIXON. The census figures were \$15,642,000 under the first, and under the second \$24,006,983. Those are the census figures for last year.

Mr. FORDNEY. Produced in this country?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know anything about those figures. I presume they are correct. They may be a different class of goods.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The name of the great Henry Clay, of the State of Kentucky, has been assailed upon the floor of this House, and I can not sit idly by and see his fair name or his deeds misrepresented. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] for the purpose of giving an example of repartee, made the statement that it was Randolph who stepped aside and let Mr. Clay pass. If I read history aright it was Henry Clay who stepped aside. It was a rainy day, and there was a boardwalk across the street, not wide enough for both men to pass. Great feeling existed between Randolph upon the one hand and Clay upon the other, and as the two men were approaching each other one of them had to get off the boards. Mr. Randolph, approaching Clay, said—I can not give his exact language upon an occasion of this character, but he said in substance—that he did not give the sidewalk to any infamous scoundrel. Mr. Clay, the courteous gentleman that he was, the compromiser of difficulties, the avoicer for 10 years of civil strife between the States, stepped aside and said, "I do." It is in justice to the fair name and fame of Henry Clay and in the interest of the truth of history that I make this statement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at my friends thinking we ought to have a tariff board when they come to treating some schedules like this. My friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is always well informed, and he is a man for whom I have the highest respect, because, although on the tariff question we differ as far as the North and the South Poles, he is an honest protectionist, and he is sincere, because he will protect the other fellow as well as himself, and you do not find many of that kind. [Applause.] But I want to call my friend's attention to this fact. He is complaining of this rate because we do not protect the labor cost. Now, I find in the census reports of 1905 that the production of the pottery indus-

try was something over \$76,000,000. I am giving only round figures now, because I have not had a chance to estimate to the last detail, but I am giving the substance. There was \$76,000,000 of production. The wages paid were \$29,000,000, which made the wage rate 38 per cent of the cost of production.

Now, take a dollar's worth of production. Of course, at an ad valorem rate of 35 per cent you would have 35 per cent of incidental or actual protection, whichever you want to call it. I do not warrant the figures that the gentleman has presented in Mr. Burgess's brief. I am not criticizing Mr. Burgess, but I think the figures as to the difference in wage cost are clearly exaggerated on Mr. Burgess's side of the question. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that he is right, that the wage scale in Europe is only one-fourth of the wage scale here, if you will take the 38 per cent of wages as shown by the census report and take one-fourth off of 38 per cent, it leaves you but 29 per cent of wages, and we have given in this bill 35 per cent of protection of wages. So even according to the exaggerated reports of the brief that my friend has presented this 35 per cent covers the difference in the wage scale by more than 6 per cent.

So, it is not a question of wages. I can not speak for every paragraph in this bill, but I can recall no paragraph in the bill where the difference in wages between this and a foreign country is not covered by the rates now in the bill.

Now, there is only one other question: The gentleman says, and says correctly, that paragraphs 93 and 94 of the present law and in this bill paragraphs 81 and 82 are highly competitive, and therefore we ought not to have reduced these rates. My friends, as you treat them as a whole they are highly competitive, but the only reason that the gentleman has made this assertion that the rates ought not to be changed is because he has not studied the question.

Under paragraphs 93 and 94 of the present law china and earthen ware are imported under the same paragraph. There was no distinction drawn between chinaware and earthenware. Now, it was with great difficulty that the committee was able to differentiate between chinaware and earthenware. We did not do it ourselves, but we sent to different parts of this country to get an expert. Finally the Government sent Mr. McNair, from the port of New York, who is considered the greatest china expert in this country; and he perfected this classification that in paragraph 81 taxes earthenware and in paragraph 82 taxes chinaware.

What was the condition under your law as it exists to-day? You had a highly competitive rate on chinaware, a luxury that should bear a high rate. But you put the same tax on earthenware, the dishes of the poor, that you did on chinaware, and made it prohibitive and brought no revenue whatever to the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, this committee, after great labor and great trouble, have differentiated between the two, and we have practically kept your rate; we have reduced it from 60 to 55, but practically kept your rate on luxuries, chinaware, where the competition arises, and we have reduced the rate on earthenware, where there were no importations coming in. Oh, I think there was a little in high-grade decorated earthenware, but, as a rule, you may say there were no importations coming through the customhouse at all on earthenware. We have reduced it to a competitive basis. On what you had as competitive we have left the rate alone.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps the figures given by the gentleman to me are on a higher grade of ware than the average, which might make the difference in the labor cost as described by the gentleman from Alabama; but if the figures the gentleman has given me are right—that we have some \$37,000,000 consumption in this country, and only \$15,000,000 of that produced in this country—then, certainly, the present rates are not too high, and they are not prohibitive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is talking about chinaware, and I am talking about earthenware. We have left the rate on chinaware practically as it is, and on earthenware we have reduced it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The President of the United States, so far as his chief political career is concerned, originated in the city of Trenton, N. J., the distinguished pottery town. The mayor of that city was a particular friend of the President of the United States, whose policy is being enacted here to-night by the enactment of this bill with the assistance of the gentleman from Alabama. The mayor is the first commission mayor under the Woodrow Wilson system in the State of New Jersey. He is a friend of the laboring man who works in the potteries of Trenton, N. J. In view of the fact that the committee does not seem

to care to discuss labor conditions at all, but seeks only to obtain revenue in this bill, and to discuss the tariff rates, I desire to quote from the mayor of Trenton, N. J., the commission mayor, a good Democrat and a warm supporter of the President of the United States, in his defense. He says:

On china we have \$8,000,000 (foreign value) of \$18,000,000 (American landed value) against our home production of \$2,000,000.

The committee has, in the face of these facts and in face of their oft-repeated declarations relative to desiring only fair competitive rates and their purpose not to injure any legitimate business in this country, cut the rate on china from 55 per cent on white and 60 per cent on decorated to 50 per cent and 55 per cent, respectively, and on earthenware from 55 per cent on white and 60 per cent on decorated to 35 per cent and 40 per cent, respectively.

COST OF PRODUCTION.

The total cost of producing earthenware in the United States is over 75 per cent greater than in England. The average rate of wages paid in the United States is about 110 per cent higher than in England.

From 60 per cent to 66½ per cent of the total cost of pottery ware made in the United States goes directly into the pay rolls and pay envelopes, depending on the kind of ware made and whether decorated or undecorated.

Any reduction in the cost of production made necessary by the lowering of the tariff and allowing the cheap European and oriental labor produced goods to reduce our selling price must of necessity fall heaviest on the wage earner.

I thank God for this honest expression of an honest opinion by an honest Democrat.

HOW THE POTTERY INDUSTRY WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE BILL.

Mr. AUSTIN. In spite of the fact that the Representative from Texas [Mr. DIES] is on the floor, I am going to quote some more figures from the Committee on Ways and Means, and I hope he will not try to repudiate the report of his own committee, even if they have placed wool on the free list, which affects his district very largely. I am not going to engage in a joint discussion with the gentleman from Texas, but I shall endeavor to arrange with President Wilson or his old friend, the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, to have a joint discussion on free raw wool.

Under paragraph 81, now under consideration, according to the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, found on page 74, we will increase the importations from \$8,603,674 to \$10,000,000 per annum, or an increase in four years—and that is just as long as this bill will remain on the statutes—of something over \$5,000,000—about \$5,600,000. The average amount of wages is 60 per cent, and 60 per cent of \$1,400,000, the increase under this paragraph, is \$840,000 in wages in one year, or \$3,360,000 in wages in four years. So under this single paragraph you are going to take from the pottery workers in Trenton, N. J., and in the Youngstown, Ohio, district, and in other parts of the United States \$840,000 in wages in 12 months. What are you going to do with these wage earners? You said in your platform that under a Republican protective-tariff system the Republican Party made "the rich richer and the poor poorer." When you legislate out of employment men who are drawing \$840,000 a year in wages in the pottery industry in this country, are you going to make them richer or poorer?

If there is anything in the newspaper reports, the gentleman representing the Trenton district, Mr. WALSH, and the Democratic Member representing the Youngstown, Ohio, district, Mr. WHITACE, in your caucus occupied considerable time in an effort to convince you that this proposed legislation would seriously cripple and injure the pottery industries in their districts.

The Democratic Party had this pledge in their platform, that they "would not injure any legitimate industry." Is the pottery industry of Trenton, N. J., a legitimate industry, and is the alleged statement of the Democratic Member of Congress from that district [Mr. WALSH] correct, that this proposed legislation will cripple and injure that industry and turn the wage earners out of employment in the potteries of that district?

On the day that the President addressed the House of Representatives from the Clerk's desk I talked with a new Member from the State of New Jersey. I asked him how the people of New Jersey regarded this new tariff bill, and his reply was that they are very much up in arms against it. This is shown in the public meeting in Passaic, N. J., a few nights ago, when by a unanimous vote the commercial organization of that city condemned this bill. I also asked the new Democratic Member from New Jersey what would be the result of this legislation as far as the next election in New Jersey was concerned, and his reply was that it will defeat every one of them for a reelection. It will do more than that, Mr. Chairman; it will defeat your party at the polls four years from now. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the statements made as matters of fact by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and by other gentlemen with reference to wages, evidently discloses to this House that the tariff has but little

to do with wages. In the first place, labor is a commodity, based upon, first, the principle of the cost of keep, of production; and, second, upon the supply of work and of the supply of labor; and the third and cheapest element of high wages is organization. The difference between the wage in Mississippi and Washington and Oregon is explained in the fact that you can not organize the negro, and further, the fact that the cost of keep in wages in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Arkansas is less than the cost in Oregon and in Washington. The difference in wage in England, a free-trade country, and in Germany, a protective country, is found in the cost of keeping, because the English are a beef-eating people, while the German is a sauerkraut consumer. [Laughter.] You will find that wages in Mexico are not high, that the ordinary peon will milk goats all day for 10 cents. He can thrive upon his tortilla.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No. They have no organization to maintain a wage.

Now, then, after we get the cost of keep in wages you can raise it higher by organization, but you can not raise it higher than a reasonable profit to the man who employs the labor, but between the cost of keeping and the cost of local production it may conflict and go up or down in proportion to the ability of the laboring men in the organization to maintain that wage. The reason why the cost of a laborer in Massachusetts is greater than a like cost in the South is almost wholly due to the question of organization. They have never been enabled in the South to maintain that organization as they have in the New England States. It is true that wages are high in America, and we are glad of it, but it is due principally to the one fact that the laboring men say, we want more than enough to eat or enough to keep us, we want enough on certain occasions that we may dress our family well, that we may educate our children, that we may maintain that dignity in society becoming a human individual. They get more because they demand more, but whenever they cease to demand they will cease to get that wage irrespective of tariff laws or any other legislation by this Government.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. FARR. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that labor in England is the best organized in the world?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. And I am aware also that the cost of wage to keep it in England is cheaper than it is in America.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. No; the gentleman is stating facts and not asking questions, or, rather, trying to state facts by innuendo.

Mr. FARR. No; I am making a very pertinent, direct question.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. And the gentleman is trying to inject into my statement a statement of fact that is not wholly true.

Mr. FARR. Entirely true; I will give the gentleman a statement of fact that is entirely true.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I can not yield further; my time is nearly up and I desire to conclude.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will not the gentleman yield to enable me to ask him a question bearing upon this point? I desire to ask the gentleman if he has considered why wages are higher in protection Germany, for illustration, than in protection Belgium?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That, I have no doubt, will be found in an explanation of the difference between the cost in Oregon and Washington and the cost in Mississippi and Arkansas, the cost of wage.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. No; Belgium is highly organized and so is Germany.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I am not undertaking to say; I did not speak of organization, but of the keep of wage.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why are wages higher in Germany than in France, for illustration?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The cost of keep in wages, as I said before, is cheaper in the Southern States than Oregon or Washington. I dare say that is true with reference to the two countries to which the gentleman referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit just one question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can speak in his own time.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have spoken once, and I did not want to intrude again. I only wanted to say this: There is no organi-

zation in the lumber camps in Mississippi, in the State of Washington, or any other State of this Union I have ever heard of.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to speak on this paragraph? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the scene has shifted since early in the evening, as I predicted it would. Then we had seated beside our amiable and beloved friend from Alabama a confessed free trader, to whom it is a matter of complete indifference what the effect of schedules on American employment and American wages may be. The gentleman who now occupies the seat of honor next to the chairman of the committee is apparently somewhat concerned about American employment, and he endeavors to persuade us, without saying so in plain words, that as to most of the items under discussion they have endeavored to cover the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. In connection with this matter of labor cost and wages I have been very much interested in what the gentleman from Oklahoma has said.

It is an old, sophistical, threadbare argument, scarcely worthy of being dignified by being referred to as an argument, that by organization men can wring a living wage from an enterprise that does not pay. Did you increase the wages of the sheep herders in Wyoming when you put them out of business under the Wilson bill? Will all of the organizations in the world increase wages or maintain wages in the industries that are injured by the passage of this act? It is true that organization is useful and valuable and necessary.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I have only five minutes. As I said, organization is useful and valuable if men are to secure from their employers a reasonable proportion of the wealth they create, but men can organize from now until doomsday, and they can not draw from an industry any portion of a profit that the industry does not have or create. They do organize in England, it is the best labor-organized country on the face of the earth, and yet the average rate of wage in England is considerably less than half of that in the United States. It is much lower in many of the highly organized industries in England than it is in the unorganized industries here. Organization can, and organization does, compel the payment of a fair wage, and a fair wage is the wage that an industry can stand and live. No amount of organization, no amount of strife, no demands that can be made, can compel men, or ever has compelled men, to pay wages so high that they can not conduct their business at a profit. Our wages are higher in this country under organization, because by and through a protective tariff that maintains prices it is possible for the manufacturer to pay a good wage, and therefore possible for the organized laborer and the organized artisan to compel the payment of a good wage.

But take from the industry its profits, place it in competition with unpaid labor abroad, make it nonproductive, and you can make bread of stones and draw blood from a turnip as easily as you can secure a living wage under those conditions.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. The gentleman remembers the organization of the Cobden clubs in England, the adoption of free trade in that country, and the history of it. Why was it between the wage before and after the free-trade laws, the corn laws, were adopted that wages went down to the difference between the cost of living before the laws were passed and after the laws were passed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN. That question never will be answered.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

82. China and porcelain wares composed of a vitrified nonabsorbent body having a vitrified or semivitrified fracture, and all bisque and parian wares, including clock cases with or without movements; plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, statues, statuettes, mugs, cups, steins, lamps, and all other articles composed wholly or in chief value of such ware, if plain white, or plain brown, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner; and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem;

if painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner and manufactures in chief value of such ware not specially provided for in this section, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 20, line 4, by striking out the semicolon after the word "movements" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. During the general debate yesterday evening the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] was making a speech, and I propounded to the gentleman a question something like this: He was talking about the increase of wages and I asked him if it were not a fact that from 1899 to 1909 the increase in the annual wages paid—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is not speaking to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

86. Glass bottles, decanters, and all articles of every description composed wholly or in chief value of glass, ornamented or decorated in any manner, or cut, engraved, painted, decorated, ornamented, colored, stained, silvered, gilded, etched, sand blasted, frosted, or printed in any manner, or ground (except such grinding as is necessary for fitting stoppers or for purposes other than ornamentation), and all articles of every description, including bottles and bottle glassware, composed wholly or in chief value of glass blown either in a mold or otherwise; all of the foregoing, not specially provided for in this section, filled or unfilled, and whether their contents be dutiable or free, 45 per cent ad valorem; *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, bottles with cut-glass stoppers shall, with the stoppers, be deemed entireties.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 9, after the word "free," strike out the figures "45" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "60."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the cut-glass industry in the United States is comparatively new. It is growing. It is subject to the fiercest competition. The Japanese are now beginning to send cut glass to this country. Under the Panama Canal act a special advantage was given to foreign manufacturers of cut glass in that they can now send in practically free the cut glass that enters into the equipment of ships built in the United States. American factories have already suffered materially for this reason. Orders have been solicited even by the Navy Department of the United States from foreign sources.

Much of this is due, no doubt, to the conditions that prevail on the Panama Canal, where free trade practically prevails. Those industries that are undertaking to manufacture cut glass in the United States and build up an American industry ask that the existing duties be retained, because they are already suffering from the conditions I have stated, and in order to avoid competition, particularly from Japanese and Belgian sources, it is urged that the amendment raising the rate from 45 per cent, fixed now in the Underwood bill, to 60 per cent ad valorem be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

87. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, seven-eighths of 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, 1½ cents per pound; above that, 2 cents per pound; *Provided*, That unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of glass.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 12, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"87. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued at more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound;

valued at more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, 2½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, 3½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, 3½ cents per pound; above that, 4½ cents per pound; *Provided*, That unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of glass."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if I can retain my right to the floor I will ask that the Clerk read the next section, in order that I may offer the amendment to that section that I hold in my hand and will send up to the Clerk's desk. Then I shall make such observations as I have concerning the two sections all under one head.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the two paragraphs may be considered at the same time.

Mr. DIXON. That is all right.

Mr. MANN. As if they were one paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that paragraphs 87 and 88 may be considered at the same time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report paragraph 88.

The Clerk read as follows:

88. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, not exceeding 384 square inches, 3 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 1,440 square inches, 7 cents per square foot; above that, 10 cents per square foot.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the Clerk will report the amendment presented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 1, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"88. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, not exceeding 384 square inches, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 1,440 square inches, 12 cents per square foot; above that, 15 cents per square foot."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no theory held by the Democratic Party upon the tariff question that will justify the reductions that have been made in these two sections.

No one has complained in recent years about the high price of plain window glass. It is very cheap in the United States, and does not figure extensively in the cost of the building of the average house. I doubt if any one in any way connected with the preparation of this bill has heard any complaint at all about the high price of window glass, so that the committee can not claim, or the Democratic Party can not claim, that it is reducing the duty on window glass for the purpose of reducing the cost of living or enabling the poor to get cheaper window glass in their houses.

In the second place, it can not work an advantage on the theory that it will produce revenue unless at the same time the Democratic Party admits that they will close for an additional length of time the glass factories of the country which produce window glass to-day. The glass factories of my district run about seven months in a year; no longer. In every glass-factory town in my district the laborers have held meetings, which have been largely attended, and these laborers have sent to me petitions, drafted by themselves, protesting against the provisions of this bill, which they say will reduce the time during which they may hope to have employment in a year from seven months to anywhere from three to three and a half or four months in a year.

They say that they can not live in the way in which they have been taught to live as American laborers and compete with the Belgian product of window glass. The reason why they can not compete is that they live upon a higher plane than those who produce the commodity with which they would have to compete in our markets. It is easy enough for them to run in the United States more than seven months in the year if they are willing to come down to the plane of the lowest paid labor that produces window glass that has access to our markets. If they will take a reduction in wages they can run. If they refuse to take a reduction in wages Belgium will supply the window glass of the United States, the glass factories in the United States will close their doors, and the laborers employed in them will be wandering around over the highways of the country hunting for work and unable to find it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] made some observations about the beef eaters of England. Why, there are very few laborers in England or anywhere in Europe or anywhere outside of the United States who are beef eaters. They may have a little meat upon the table of laboring men outside of the United States once or twice a week, but the instances

are rare. The American laborer lives like a man. He puts meat upon his table two or three times a day, every day in the week that he wants to, when the product of his labor is protected from a ruinous competition with the products of lower paid labor in other countries of the world.

There is no question in the minds of the laborers who are engaged in making window glass that they will lose their jobs as a result of the passage of this bill if you maintain this schedule. There has been a large glass industry in the State of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Dixon]. I am not sure that there is now.

Mr. DIXON. Yes; there is.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that many of the best former citizens of Indiana are now citizens of my district. There are no better men than they. They are glass blowers, and they are the men who have been writing to me, sending me letters and petitions, telling me that they want to work more than three months in the year; that they want to work for the standard of wages that they have been receiving, and at the same time giving the people of the country as cheap glass as anybody could want as a result of labor well employed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I spoke a little while ago about gypsum as a product of Oklahoma. Oklahoma has something else besides gypsum. Oklahoma produces glass. There are a number of glass factories in Oklahoma. The fact is that if our State could be kept under the protective-tariff policy it would become one of the great manufacturing States of this country.

The glass factories in Oklahoma do not happen to be in my district, but they are in my State, and in part I represent on this floor the entire State of Oklahoma. So when it happens that my colleagues who represent those districts that have the glass factories do not rise here to speak for the men who labor in those glass factories, to protect their interests, I am glad to do it. I maintain that under the rates in this bill the wages in our glass factories will have to be reduced.

I want to read something here from the bulletin issued by the Bureau of the Census to show how under a protective tariff wages have increased. When I called the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Hardwick] last night to the increase in wages from 1890 to 1899, he insisted that the increase had not been 70 per cent, as I contended it had been. But here in this Government document it shows that the increase from 1899 to 1900 was 70 per cent. I mean in the total amount of wages paid. This table shows that in 1890 the sum of \$378,000,000 was paid out to laborers in the manufacturing industries of this country. Yet after half a century of protection, except for a short period, we paid out in 1909 to the wage earners in our manufacturing establishments \$3,427,000,000 a year. To-day probably the total wages paid to laborers in manufacturing establishments in the United States amount to \$4,000,000,000. No other country on earth pays out so large an amount in wages anywhere, and in no other country do we distribute such an amount of the total wealth in wages. That is the way that we must distribute wealth, in large degree, through wages.

And when you pursue a policy, when the gentleman from Alabama, as head of the Ways and Means Committee, the leader of the majority in this House, with all his ability and courtesy to every Member of the House, leads the House and the Nation into a tariff policy that will reduce the total amount of wages paid out, it means a loss to every one of the 7,000,000 men who are employed in the manufacturing industries, and I protest against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas desired to consider the two paragraphs together and talks about the effect on the wages of the laboring men of this country by reason of the reduction of the rates in the two paragraphs. There is no glass produced in this country under this second paragraph. That is all imported, and the reduction of 1 cent a square foot will not in any way affect the wages of the American workman.

As to the other schedule the reductions are probably radical, but as a matter of fact there have been no importations of glass for glazing purposes in the United States since the passage of the Payne bill. As a matter of fact, the glass manufacturers of this country have not taken the full advantage of the present tariff and they sell in competition among themselves at a lower price than the foreign manufacturer can import his goods into this country, pay the duty and the freight, and for that reason imported glass for glazing purposes is not sold in any part of the United States.

The window glass that is imported is used for pictures. They import a better class of window glass than is manufactured by a number of window-glass manufacturers. It is higher priced, and for that reason it is imported and does pay the duty.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas in his amendment asks that the rates of the Payne bill shall be reenacted. There is not a glass manufacturer that has appeared before the committee or has talked to the members of the committee privately that has asked for any such rates. They concede that the rates above the inch bracket, 36 by 24, unit of 60, is not necessary to keep it where it is now, and they are willing to-day to concede that the rates in our bill as to the large brackets are higher than necessary to protect them from competition from abroad, and we have not lowered it in these brackets, for the reason that there is imported a large amount of colored glass that is based upon the same rate plus 4 per cent, and we would be allowing that kind of glass to come in at a rate that is entirely too low if we would reduce the rate on this class, and for that reason as to the larger brackets under this bill there will be no tariff competition with the glass manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the gentleman will permit, the letters and petitions I have from the men who blow glass say that the bill will affect them, and they ask that the duties be retained at just about what they are at the present time. Let me ask the gentleman what possible service the committee can render to the country by reducing the tariff upon glass if already we are selling the American product in this country cheaper than any foreigner can produce a like glass and can sell their product?

Mr. DIXON. Immediately after the passage of the Payne bill there was a combination made, by which the prices were increased up to the full benefit of the tariff, and while that did not last for any great length of time, while it did last the American consumers were compelled to pay too much, too large a price, for the glass. After the combination was dissolved, after suit was brought in the United States court, and the directors were compelled to pay large fines, totaling, I think, about \$10,000, that combination was dissolved, and then there was competition between the different manufacturers and the price has been reduced, so that they take no advantage of the present tariff. What we want to do is to reduce the rate so that there will be no future combination.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But the Sherman antitrust law is still in force, and I take it it will not be repealed within the next four years.

Mr. DIXON. While we have reduced the rates considerably, if the gentleman will take the prices to-day on Belgian glass, the French price, and add our duty and freight, and you can take the glass manufactured in Pennsylvania, pay the freight to the New York market and compete. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound an inquiry to my distinguished friend at the head of the table. I have heard a good deal said about the desirability of ad valorem duties as against specific duties, by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, and a good deal said upon this side about the desirability of specific duties instead of ad valorem duties. I have noticed, I think, up to this point in the bill in the main that gentlemen preparing the bill have given preference to what they announce is the only scientific policy, namely, ad valorem duties instead of specific duties, yet, lo and behold, we now reach a point in the bill where the gentleman says the existing tariff has no effect, that we are making and selling glass here more cheaply than anybody can bring it from abroad, and where certainly, if at any place, an ad valorem duty could be safely tried, it could be tried here. Yet I notice that in spite of all of the arguments in favor of ad valorem duties, the gentlemen provide only for specific duties. Why is it?

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, in the importation of glass, it comes in large boxes. To take those pieces of glass out and examine the different crates would require considerable time and considerable expense and uncertainty. For that reason we prefer this; and I will say that the appraisers thought that this was preferable to the other on account of the increased cost in the administration.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I think the appraisers are in favor of specific duties all the way through. Certainly it requires more effort to open the boxes and ascertain the rates fixed in the bill under specific duties than it would to take the invoices and fix the rates on ad valorem duties, because that does not require the opening of the boxes. This requires the actual inspection in some way of the glass for specific duties, in which, of course, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

90. Cast polished plate glass, finished or unfinished and unsilvered, or the same containing a wire netting within itself, not exceeding 384 square inches, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 8 cents per square foot; all above that, 12 cents per square foot.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 22, strike out the figure "6" and insert "10." In line 24, on the same page, strike out the figure "8" and insert the figures "12½"; and in the same line strike out the figures "12" and insert the figures "22½."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment I will explain as briefly as possible. In 1909, when the Payne tariff law was being prepared by the committee, according to my recollection the importations of the smaller sizes of plate glass, which then paid a rate of duty of 8 and 10 cents per square foot, had increased from 250,000 square feet to, as I now remember, several million feet. The rates of duty on the larger sizes, something below 720 square inches, were 22½ cents per square foot, and on large sizes, above 720 inches, 35 cents per square foot. This showed that the rates of duty on the lower sizes were entirely inadequate to keep out of our market a great surplus of that size of glass made abroad. In the making of plate glass when the plate is rolled out, if it comes through the rolls without breaking, it is very valuable; but if it be broken or cracked, it then must be cut into sizes such as the pieces will make, and, like any other product, the smaller sizes are a by-product. The amount of profit made by a factory depends upon their ability to dispose of those smaller sizes at a fair advantage, and thus work off on to the market their larger sizes, so that under the Dingley tariff law the duties on the smaller sizes were evidently entirely too low to protect that size of glass made in this country. In the Payne law the rates were raised from 8 and 10 cents per square foot to from 10 to 12½ cents per square foot; and the importations under those prices of those sizes are now small, showing that the increased rates given in the Payne tariff have become effective.

Protecting the industry here by keeping out of our markets these smaller sizes that were greatly embarrassing the manufacturers of plate glass in this country. Again, gentlemen, no matter what the rate of duty on plate glass is, I have in my possession a statement prepared some two years ago, showing that on imported glass from Germany there is a discrimination of freight rates in this country against domestic glass. On a consignment of glass from Germany to St. Louis or Chicago entering New Orleans, such imports paid a rate of freight at that time from Germany to St. Louis or Chicago of 32 cents per hundred pounds, 12 cents of which was ocean freight and 20 cents railroad freight from New Orleans to St. Louis or Chicago; but if that glass were to originate in St. Louis the rate of freight by railway from New Orleans to St. Louis is 75 cents per hundred pounds; but in Germany, where much of the railroads are owned by the Government, the railroads give a cheaper rate on any article made in Germany shipped from an inland town to the seaboard for export—a much lower rate, about one-half the rate that is placed upon those goods if they are to be consumed in Germany. On the other hand, import goods entering Germany pay twice the freight from the seaport town to the inland town that domestic-made goods of Germany pay if they originate in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks when this bill was under general debate I claimed that the competition which ensued under a protective tariff reduced the price of the commodity below what the foreign manufacturer exacted before the tariff was levied.

This fact is borne out by actual experience in every line of manufacture. It is true of all lines of iron and steel, of cotton and woolen, of tin plate and of glassware.

The fact that domestic competing manufacturers, by combinations and trusts, absorb competition and proceed under a high tariff to extort unreasonable profits does not alter the argument that domestic competition under a protective tariff does reduce prices to the consumer below what the foreign manufacturer obliged him to pay before the tariff was levied, although it does show that besides a protective tariff there is need

of effective legislation. That will prevent such combinations and will maintain domestic competition.

GLASS.

Pertinent to the schedule now under discussion I wish to state that the plate-glass industry of the country is a case in proof.

Prior to 1875 we were importing practically all our plate glass, which was costing the actual consumer from \$1.75 to \$2.25 per square foot.

Under a tariff in 1875 we began to make plate glass and are now practically producing all we consume, with the result that the actual consumer paid per square foot in—

1875	-----	\$1.69
1880	-----	1.21
1885	-----	1.09
1890	-----	.97
1895	-----	.72
1900	-----	.90
1905	-----	.46
1908	-----	.43
1912	-----	.39

This result has been accomplished under a tariff of 22½ cents per square foot, but with actual and strenuous competition between the 12 plate-glass companies of this country.

It is now proposed to reduce the tariff from 22½ cents to 12 cents.

This reduction, at a time when no American plate-glass company is making a profit, will enable the European glass trust to occupy this market.

Especially is this apparent when freight rates are considered. The freight rate from Belgium is 2 cents per square foot in any quantity to any Pacific coast city, while the rate from Pittsburgh to those cities is 7½ cents in carload and 10 cents on less quantity, and the railroads have filed rates to increase the charges to 18 cents on less-than-carload lots.

And the figuring applies in about the same relation to window glass and other glass products.

Freight on glass from Belgium to San Francisco is about one-fifth as much as the freight from Pittsburgh to San Francisco and one-third as much from Belgium to New Orleans as from Pittsburgh to New Orleans.

The Democratic Party, despite its promises not to injure an industry that has honestly grown up under the protective system, in which there has been no engrossing and monopolistic combinations, by this bill will throw our markets open to the European international trust, destroy American competition, and in consequence compel the American consumer to pay more for his glass.

The Democratic policy is to secure competition by surrendering our markets to the foreigner.

The Progressive policy is to secure competition amongst our American manufacturers by effective legislation to prevent monopolistic combinations, and keep our markets for Americans.

The Democrats would give our markets to competing foreigners.

The Progressives would give our markets to competitive American manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

92. Cast polished plate glass, silvered or unsilvered, and cylinder, crown, or common window glass, silvered or unsilvered, polished or unpolished, when bent, ground, obscured, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, flashed, stained, colored, painted, ornamented, or decorated, shall be subject to a duty of 4 per cent ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

This paragraph adds the rate of duty of 4 per cent ad valorem on certain glass which is rated at specific rates. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Dixon] a while ago stated that the reason they did not reduce the specific rates to ad valorem was because it would be unnecessary to unpack the boxes and take out the glass and look at it. That would be still necessary as to this 4 per cent ad valorem, would it not?

Mr. DIXON. I will state to the gentleman we could not put a specific duty on that.

Mr. MANN. But you can put an ad valorem on the other. Why did you not if you believed it?

Mr. DIXON. It was necessary to put it on in this case and it was not necessary in the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

93. Spectacles, eyeglasses, and goggles, and frames for the same, or parts thereof, finished or unfinished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my friend from Indiana if he read carefully the hearings before the Senate committee or the hearings on this question of gentlemen who appeared in behalf of the industry of making lenses special?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. They were very much agitated over these rates. They do not share in the cheerful hopefulness of the members of the committee. They are afraid, and, more than that, they feel certain they have got to cut their wages very largely or else stop business. Now, I know some of these gentlemen. I have known them for years, and they are just as honorable and just as honest as any gentleman who sits on this floor. They are conservative men. They understand their business. Oh, that slander that has to go out about the American manufacturer that does not understand his business. They say that he has to learn and brace up, and all that folly. It is un-American to indulge in it; it is unpatriotic and untruthful. Our manufacturers are in the van all the way along. They are willing to go into the markets of the United States on their own merits. They insist, and you have yielded to it, in putting a brand on the goods imported from the country of their origin in order that our people may sell. These gentlemen are lampooned, made fun of, and told that they do not understand their business.

Men who would not know a good, well-organized factory if they went into one shout loudly from their platforms and their thrones that our people do not understand their business. Why add insult to injury? Why not tell the truth? You know and I know that they understand their business. You know and I know that they have reached the point of the highest art of manufacturing. Why not be honest about it. Do not talk about their cutting down their business for effect. You will eventually shut them down by these rates that you are giving them, because they will have to work on short time and lower wages if they do anything, or else turn the key in the lock and lose the organization of their men, waiting for the people of the United States to correct this iniquitous tariff bill which you are trying to force upon the people of the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that this is the first time that I have been able to agree with him on any matter during this tariff debate. We have for a long time contended that the industries of our country were no longer infants, but that they were able to successfully compete with the industries of the world. The gentleman from New York says that our manufacturers know their business, that they have reached the highest point of efficiency and success, and I agree with him.

The Democratic Party contends that in view of that efficiency and success there is no need for and no excuse for demanding a protective tariff tax of the American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not want to injure any legitimate industry and we do not expect to do so. We want to be just and fair to all men and all concerns, and we will do that when we levy a tariff tax for revenue only. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, after the Clerk reads the next paragraph I want to move to strike out the last word. I want to tell the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] something that he does not know.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PALMER). Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

94. Lenses of glass or pebble, molded or pressed, or ground and polished to a spherical, cylindrical, or prismatic form, and ground and polished plane or coquille glasses, wholly or partly manufactured, 30 per cent ad valorem

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish this schedule to-night, but it is now 11 o'clock. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. PAYNE. I am sorry that the gentleman's colleague [Mr. HEFLIN] has run away.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and Mr. GARNER, Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce the tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 577. An act authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 30, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of inland waterway from Pamlico River through Goose Creek to Jones Bay, Pamlico County, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Tradewater River, Ky. (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination with plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Kanawha River, W. Va., with a view to increasing the height of the locks and dams on said river so as to make a 9-foot stage to the Ohio River (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAUGHAN: A bill (H. R. 4385) to increase the tax on distilled spirits and the tax on beer, lager beer, ale, porter, and other similar fermented liquors produced in the United States to equal the customs tax levied on such liquors imported, to produce revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4386) providing for a survey of Lake Champlain at Rouses Point, N. Y., and vicinity; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4387) making appropriations for irrigation investigations and experiments in the humid regions of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 4388) for the erection of a public building at Manchester, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4389) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4390) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for second homestead and desert-land entries," approved February 3, 1911 (Public, No. 340); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) granting homestead entrymen six months within which to begin improvements and establish residence, and authorizing registers and receivers to grant additional time; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4392) to constitute the District of Columbia a judicial district of the United States and to reorganize the courts in the said District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4393) to repeal an act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize and require an extension of the street railway lines of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4394) allowing credit in computing the pay of any officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for service while in the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) to amend section 177 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) to class mates in the Navy as warrant officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4397) to provide that petty officers, non-commissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States

Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) to credit certain officers of the Medical Department, United States Army, with services rendered as acting assistant surgeons during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4400) to incorporate the Virginia Terminal Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4401) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 4402) appropriating money to enable the President to propose and invite foreign governments to participate in an international conference to promote an international inquiry into the causes of the high cost of living throughout the world, and to enable the United States to participate in said conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 80) that no Member should serve on the Banking and Currency Committee who is a banker, agent, or attorney of any bank or banks, or who is the owner of any bank stock or other interest in a bank; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 81) to pay certain contingent expenses, etc.; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CURLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, favoring the reestablishment of the customs ports of New York as they formerly existed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, asking for the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, setting forth rights of the West in relation to the public domain and asking Congress to legislate in the interest of the development of the country; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, in favor of national highways and the good-roads movement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, asking passage of law prohibiting further withdrawal of public lands in New Mexico, and favoring restoration of reserved lands untimbered and not needed in reservation, and reclassification of mineral and oil lands so that such as be found not mineral be open to entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, favoring pensions for letter carriers of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, protesting against the abolishment of many customs ports of entry, and requesting that same be reestablished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, protesting against the abolishment of many customs ports of entry, and requesting that the same be reestablished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Margaret F. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) for the relief of William Henry Hayden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) for the relief of Capt. Frank B. Watson, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) for the relief of Capt. Edward T. Hartmann, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) for the relief of Lieut. S. M. Rock, United States Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) for the relief of Capt. Frederick G. Lawton, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) for the relief of Capt. James Ronayne, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4412) for the relief of Capt. Chase W. Kennedy, United States Army, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of Capt. W. W. Quinton, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4414) for the relief of Capt. Frederick B. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) for the relief of Capt. W. W. Wright and Capt. Claude B. Swezey, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) for the relief of the heirs of Lieut. R. B. Calvert, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4417) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Valentine Brasch and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4418) for the relief of the estate of Richard W. Meade, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jennie M. Hunt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to examine and settle the claim of the Wales Island Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) providing for the recognition of the heroic services of Chief Boatswain Patrick Deery, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4423) for the relief of Bessie McAlister McGuirk; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 4424) granting a pension to Susanna Olewiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) granting an increase of pension to Martin C. Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4426) to correct the military record of Peter Gouker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4427) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Teed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4428) granting an increase of pension to Edwin O. Kimberley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) granting an increase of pension to Kate Somers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4430) to reimburse Simon Caro; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4431) granting a pension to James W. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4432) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. L. Bayliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) granting an increase of pension to John Rielly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. De Pue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4435) granting an increase of pension to Ann Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4436) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4437) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4438) granting an increase of pension to Bruno Grummel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4439) granting an increase of pension to Curtis W. Lyday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4440) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to James M. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4442) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4444) for the relief of Edwin S. Metcalf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4445) granting a pension to Esther Neddo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) granting a pension to James H. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) granting a pension to John Bresett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4449) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4450) granting a pension to Homer C. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) granting a pension to William H. Merchant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) granting a pension to Claude Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) granting a pension to Andrew J. Heatley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4454) granting a pension to Philip H. George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4455) granting a pension to Rufus H. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) granting a pension to Ulysses S. G. Maus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4457) granting a pension to Heinrich Branz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4458) granting a pension to Henry Hering; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4459) granting a pension to Samuel T. Pribble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Grant Jervey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) granting an increase of pension to Edmond S. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) granting an increase of pension to Michael Balenti; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) granting an increase of pension to James V. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4465) granting an increase of pension to John W. Grimm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) granting an increase of pension to James A. Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4467) granting an increase of pension to Milton Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4468) granting an increase of pension to Norma E. McEnhill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) granting a pension to Ella M. Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 4470) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Jubitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 4471) granting a pension to John A. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4472) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Olson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 4473) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 4474) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Barlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 4475) restoring the name of Melina Day to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 4476) to correct the military record of James Shafer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the St. Charles Building and Loan Association, of St. Charles, Mo., against the income tax on building associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of G. F. Aufderheide, of Bland; Sam K. Black, jr., of Suttan; and Charles Beakman, of McKittrick, Mo., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the Baltimore Federation of Labor, condemning the action of Joseph E. Ralph, Director of

the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, for his unfair and hostile attitude to the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of sundry union printers of North America, protesting against the tendency to abuse the right of free speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Hatters of North America, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on hats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on meats, flour, wheat, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Consolidated Sheet Metal Works, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., and other corporations and citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of James Ford Rhodes and other citizens of Boston and vicinity, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary Monahan, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the clause prohibiting importation of wild-bird plumage, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Virginia Phillips, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York City, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-first Illinois district, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Hazel Atlas Glass Co., of New York, against the clause relative to importation of olives in glass bottles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of William J. Serrill, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMIL: Petition of sundry citizens of Jersey City and Hoboken, both in the State of New Jersey, favoring the passage of an amendment to the income-tax bill to exempt from taxation the proceeds of all life insurance funds, including the premium refunds to policy holders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Purabla Oil Co., of New Jersey, asking that the duty on seed shall be entirely removed or the duty on oil be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of G. E. Hume and 226 citizens, of Oxnard; R. H. Schluer and 62 citizens, of Woodland; A. C. Hughes and 51 citizens, of Salinas; D. W. Horst and 20 citizens, of Norwalk; M. O. Boggs and 20 citizens, of Colusa; Bank of Lompoc and 21 citizens, of Lompoc; H. Brunner and 33 citizens, of Santa Maria; P. F. Shepard and 30 citizens, of Van Nuys; Irving F. Sinsheimer and 22 citizens, of Huntington Beach; H. B. Farmer and 20 citizens, of El Monte; Henry Planchon and 25 citizens, of Santa Ana; and 250 other citizens, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Paul Reiger & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the increased duty on perfume materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., against reduction of the pay of customs guards at San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Ventura, Cal., against reduction of the tariff on citrus fruits, sugar, lima beans, and borax, and against the duty on grain when all by-products are free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Sherman, of Campbell, Cal., against reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Swayne, Hoyt & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the increase of the tariff on rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., for early completion of the new Golden Gate Life-Saving Station; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, against any increase of the revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Credit Men's Association of the State of Utah, favoring a reform in the banking and currency laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of the Honolulu Merchants' Association, of Honolulu, against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the fifteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Covington, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation relative to closing the gates of the Panama Exposition in California in 1915 on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of the American Association for International Conciliation, favoring the repeal of the law with reference to Panama Canal tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STONE: Memorial of the council of the city of Peoria, Ill., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Horse Creek Grange, Adams County, Colo., favoring Government loans on farm property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Farmers' Institute of Larimer County, Colo., against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 35 citizens of Douglas, Colo., favoring the placing of sugar and wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 175 citizens of Eaton, 130 citizens of Greeley, 350 citizens of Loveland, 400 citizens of Fort Collins, 320 citizens of Sterling, 295 citizens of Longmont, 153 citizens of Fort Morgan, and 55 citizens of Windsor, all in the State of Colorado, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y.; the Niagara Falls Milling Co.; and Henry D. Waters, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, against reduction of the duty on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Cutlery Co., of Chicago, Ill.; the Clement Manufacturing Co. and the Northampton Cutlery Co., of Northampton; the Lamson & Goodnow Manufacturing Co., of Shelburne Falls; the John Russell Cutlery Co., of Turners Falls, Mass.; the Goodell Co., of Antrim, N. H.; Landers, Frary & Clark, of New Britain; the Meriden Cutlery Co., of Meriden, Conn.; and the Ontario Knife Co., of Franklinville, N. Y., against reduction of the duty on table cutlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, of New York, against a change in Schedule K of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Griswold Worsted Co., of New York, N. Y., favoring a greater difference in duty than that in the tariff bill on raw hair and manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers, dyers, and finishers of cotton, corduroys, velvets, and velveteens, asking that the present rates of duty under the act of 1909, Schedule I, be continued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rochester Button Co. and the German-American Button Co., of Rochester; the Seneca Button Co., of

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; and the Federal Button Co., of Newark, N. J., against reduction of the duty on vegetable ivory buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co. and 27 other companies of New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Illinois, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the levying of the same duty on ground spices as on the whole spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against placing Philippine tobacco and cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bricklayers B. & P. Union, No. 1, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Sherman law in relation to trade-unions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers Local Union, No. 132, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., policy holders in mutual life insurance companies, against the income-tax provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Mayor George M. Wright and other citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Worcester County League of Unitarian Women, favoring the passage of the Page vocational education bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHERSPOON: Memorial of Finklea Ben and Ephriam Sam, Carthage, Miss., requesting Congress to grant their share in the Choctaw Indian fund; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1913.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, deliver us, we beseech Thee, from the bondage of sin, with its blighting, corroding, damning effects, incarcerating the soul, shutting from it the light of Thy countenance, the warmth of Thy love, the influence of divine help; eliminating self-respect; damning every avenue which leads to freedom, peace, and righteousness. We thank Thee for Thy patience, forbearance, and love, which continues its work in the spirit of the Master who revealed Thy heart to the children of men and poured out its love on Calvary that we might live in Thee, our God and our Redeemer. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all that ye do be done in love." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

96. Opera and field glasses, telescopes, microscopes, photographic and projection lenses and optical instruments and frames or mountings for the same; all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.